arXiv:1405.5917v2 [math.AG] 27 Aug 2014

THE COOLIDGE-NAGATA CONJECTURE, PART I

KAROL PALKA

Abstract. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a complex rational cuspidal curve contained in the projective plane and let $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, E)$ be the minimal log resolution of singularities. Applying the log Minimal Model Program to $(X, \frac{1}{2}D)$ we prove that if E has more than two singular points or if D, which is a tree of rational curves, has more than six maximal twigs or if $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus E$ is not of log general type then E is Cremona equivalent to a line, i.e. the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture for E holds. We show also that if E is not Cremona equivalent to a line then the morphism onto the minimal model contracts at most one irreducible curve not contained in D.

1. Main results and strategy

Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a complex planar rational curve which is *cuspidal*, i.e. which has only locally analytically irreducible (unibranched) singularities. Equivalently, it can be defined as an image of a singular embedding of a complex projective line into a complex projective plane, i.e. of a morphism $\mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ which is 1-1 on closed points. We say that two planar curves are *Cremona equivalent* if one of them is a proper transform of the other under some Cremona transformation of $\mathbb{P}^2$. Not all rational curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ are Cremona equivalent to a line (a general rational curve of degree at least six is not, see 2.6) and, clearly, the proper transform of $\bar{E}$ under a Cremona transformation does not have to be cuspidal. Therefore, the conjecture that nevertheless all cuspidal curves are Cremona equivalent to a line, which is known as the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture, comes as a surprise. It has been studied for a long time.[1] Let c be the number of cusps of $\bar{E}$ and let $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ be the minimal log resolution of singularities. In [13] we proved that

$$c \leq 9 - 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}),$$

where $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = h^0(2K_X + D)$. Let E be the proper transform of $\bar{E}$ on X. The Coolidge-Nagata conjecture for $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is known to be equivalent to the vanishing of $h^0(2K_X + E)$, so if it fails for $\bar{E}$ then we get a lower bound $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq h^0(2K_X + E) \geq 1$. The higher lower bound on $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ we can prove, the bigger is the restriction on c (in fact also on many other parameters describing the geometry of $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$), and hence the closer we are to proving the conjecture. Deepening the analysis of minimal models of $(X, \frac{1}{2}D)$ started in [13] (which is an analog of the 'theory of peeling' [9, §2.3] for half-integral divisors) we show here the following result.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 14H50; Secondary: 14J17, 14E07.

Key words and phrases. Cuspidal curve, rational curve, Cremona transformation, Coolidge-Nagata conjecture, log Minimal Model Program.

The author was partially supported by the Foundation For Polish Science under the Homing Plus programme cofinanced from the European Union, Regional Development Fund and by the National Science Center (NCN), Poland, grant No. 2012/05/D/ST1/03227.

[1] Coolidge [2, Book IV,§II.2] and Nagata [11] studied planar rational curves and their behaviour under the action of the Cremona group. The problem of determining which rational curves are Cremona equivalent to a line is known as the 'Coolidge-Nagata problem'.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a complex rational cuspidal curve which is not Cremona equivalent to a line and let $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ be the minimal log resolution of singularities. Then $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \in \{3, 4\}$. Equivalently, $(K_X + D)^2 \in \{1, 2\}$.*



FIGURE 1. The divisor D on X. Black lines are chains of rational curves. (-1)-curves are dashed. The big horizontal line is E.

The divisor D is a tree of smooth rational curves and the number of its components reflects the complexity of singularities of $\bar{E}$. Because of the minimality of the resolution, the exceptional divisor over each cusp, which is a part of D, contains at least two maximal twigs of D, hence D has at least $2c$ maximal twigs (see Fig. 1). Based on the above theorem we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a complex rational cuspidal curve and let $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ be the minimal log resolution of singularities. If any of the following conditions holds:*
(a) $\bar{E}$ has more than two cusps,
(b) D has more than six maximal twigs,
(c) $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is not of log general type,
then $\bar{E}$ satisfies the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture, i.e. there exists a Cremona transformation of $\mathbb{P}^2$ which maps $\bar{E}$ onto a line.

We also prove the following important property of the birational minimalization morphism $\psi' \colon (X, \frac{1}{2}D) \to (X'_n, \frac{1}{2}D'_n)$ resulting from the log MMP (see Sections 4.1 and 6).

Theorem 1.3. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 the minimalization morphism $\psi' \colon (X, \frac{1}{2}D) \to (X'_n, \frac{1}{2}D'_n)$ contracts at most one irreducible curve not contained in D, i.e. $n \leq 1$.*

We now explain our strategy. Let $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ be as above, with $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ not Cremona equivalent to a line. The case $\kappa(X \setminus D) \leq 1$ is done using structure theorems for open surfaces (2.5), so we may assume $\kappa(X \setminus D) = 2$. But now $X \setminus D$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-acyclic surface of log general type, so it is well known that it does not contain lines (after removing the line we would get an affine surface of log general type with non-positive Euler characteristic, which is impossible by 2.2). Then the birational morphism onto the (singular) minimal model of (X, D) is well described, it contracts only the rays supported on D and its subsequent images (hence (X, D) is *almost minimal*, see [9, 2.3.11, 2.4.3]). Unfortunately the nefness of the log canonical divisor of this minimal model, even coupled with the log BMY inequality, gives rather weak consequences. Our key idea in

this situation is simple. By the Kumar-Murthy criterion 2.4(iii) we have $2K_X + E \geq 0$, so in particular $\kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}D) \geq \kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}E) \geq 0$. This means that we can run the log MMP for $(X, \frac{1}{2}D)$ to obtain a minimal model $(X', \frac{1}{2}D')$ for which $K_{X'} + \frac{1}{2}D'$ is nef. The occurrence of $\frac{1}{2}$ changes (complicates) the situation entirely. Now $(X, \frac{1}{2}D)$ is not any more almost minimal, i.e. some curves not contained in D are contracted, but the advantage is that the nefness of $K_{X'} + \frac{1}{2}D'$ is a much stronger property. In particular, our main inequality (4.4) is obtained simply by intersecting the latter divisor with the push-forward of the effective divisor $K_X + \frac{1}{2}E$. In fact we gain a complete control over the shape and weights of D', because by [13, 1.2(2)] the possible pairs (X'_n, D'_n) are well described, in particular there is a finite list of possible weighted dual graphs of D'_n and in our situation we have additional restrictions 4.5. However, since the obtained bounds do not immediately lead to a contradiction, we need to translate them to the level of (X, D) and rule out the remaining configurations by referring to the geometry of cuspidal curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Not to loose anything in translation, in Section 4, which is the technical core of the article, we introduce tools to carefully control the process of minimalization. We show that the minimalization morphism $\psi' \colon (X, \frac{1}{2}D) \to (X', \frac{1}{2}D') = (X'_n, \frac{1}{2}D'_n)$ is a composition of $n \geq 0$ contractions $\psi'_i \colon (X'_{i-1}, \frac{1}{2}D'_{i-1}) \to (X'_i, \frac{1}{2}D'_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, such that $X'_i \setminus D'_i$ is an open subset of $X'_{i-1} \setminus D'_{i-1}$ with the complement isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^*$. It turns out that as long as D is not very small (has more than six maximal twigs) we are able to deal with the situation completely. Theorem 1.3 rules out all cases in which $n > 1$. Thus the essential difficulty to overcome to prove the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture in the remaining cases of uni- and bi-cuspidal curves is the situation when $n = 1$ and $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 3$ (see 7.4), or equivalently, $(K_X + D)^2 = 1$. We will address this problem in a forthcoming paper.

At a conference in Montreal in September 2012, *The Topology of Algebraic Varieties*, Mariusz Koras, who is independently working on the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture, has shown a proof that $(K_X + D)^2 \neq -1$ using different methods and announced that he proved the conjecture for unicuspidal curves. At the same conference, the author has shown how to extend the methods from [12] to prove it for cuspidal curves with more than three cusps. The ideas from [12] are used in Section 7 after the corollaries from the log MMP are established.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Mikhail Zaidenberg for turning his attention to cuspidal curves and discussing results in the literature.

Contents

1. Main results and strategy 1
2. Preliminaries 4
2.1. Log surfaces and divisors 4
2.2. Rational cuspidal curves 6
3. Characteristic pairs 7
4. Minimal models 10
4.1. Review of the log MMP for $(X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0)$ 11
4.2. The log MMP and the Cremona equivalence 13
5. Proof of Theorem 1.1 18
6. The length of the minimalization process 28
7. The Coolidge-Nagata conjecture 30
References 34

2. Preliminaries

We recall basic definitions from the theory of non-complete surfaces (see [3] and [9]). We work over the field of complex numbers.

2.1. *Log surfaces and divisors*

Given two $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors T, T' we say that T' is a *subdivisor of* T, we write $T' \leq T$, if $T - T'$ is effective. Let T be a reduced divisor on a smooth projective surface X. If R is a reduced subdivisor of T we define $\beta_T(R) = R \cdot (T - R)$ and we call it a *branching number of* R *in* T. If R is irreducible and nonzero we say that R is a *tip* or a *branching component* if $\beta_T(R) \leq 1$ or $\beta_T(R) \geq 3$ respectively. We say that T is an snc-divisor if its irreducible components are smooth and intersect transversally, at most two in one point. We call T a *chain* if it is a connected snc-divisor whose dual graph is linear. A subdivisor of T is a *twig* of T if it is a chain which contains no branching components of T and contains a tip of T. We say that T is a *(rational) tree* if it is an snc-divisor with connected support (whose all components are rational and) such that the dual graph of T contains no loops. A fork is a tree with exactly one branching component. The *arithmetic genus of* T is $p_a(T) = \frac{1}{2}T \cdot (K + T) + 1$, where K is the canonical divisor (class) on X. For a rational tree $p_a(T) = 0$. We denote the Iitaka-Kodaira dimension of the divisor T on X by $\kappa(T)$ and the Picard rank, i.e. the rank of the Neron-Severi group of X by $\rho(X)$. If $T = T_1 + \ldots + T_k$ is a decomposition of an ordered rational chain into irreducible components, such that $T_i \cdot T_{i+1} = 1$ for $i < k$, then we write $T = [-T_1^2, -T_2^2, \ldots, -T_k^2]$. By $(m)_p$ we mean a sequence $(m, m, \ldots, m)$ of length p. By a curve we mean a one-dimensional irreducible and reduced variety. An (n)-*curve* is a smooth rational curve with self-intersection n. A (-1)-curve which is a component of T as above is called *superfluous* if it intersects at most two other components of T, each at most once and transversally. We define the *discriminant of* T as $d(T) = \det(-Q(T))$, where $Q(T)$ is the intersection matrix of T. We put $d(0) = 1$. By $\#T$ we denote the number of irreducible components of T.

If T' is a rational twig without superfluous (-1)-curves and with a negative definite intersection matrix, or more generally, if it is a rational ordered chain (i.e. a chain with a choice of a tip) with these properties, we put

$$\operatorname{ind}(T') = \frac{d(T' - \operatorname{tip}(T'))}{d(T')} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(T') = \frac{1}{d(T')}.$$

The former number is usually called the *inductance* or *capacity* of T'.

Assume now that T is a connected snc-divisor with rational components and no superfluous (-1)-curves. Assume that its intersection matrix is not negative definite (this is the case when T is an snc-minimal boundary of an affine surface) and that the intersection matrices of all its maximal twigs are negative definite (this is the case if $\kappa(K + T) \geq 0$). Let T_i, $i = 1, \ldots, t$, be the maximal twigs of T. We put

$$\operatorname{ind}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \operatorname{ind}(T_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \delta(T_i).$$

Assume additionally that $\kappa(K + T) \geq 0$. We have the Fujita-Zariski decomposition $K + T = (K + T)^+ + (K + T)^-$, where $(K + T)^+$ is numerically effective and $(K + T)^-$ is effective, either empty or having a negative definite intersection matrix. Moreover, $(K + T)^+ \cdot B = 0$ for any curve B contained in $\operatorname{Supp}(K + T)^-$. If T_i is a (not necessarily maximal) twig of T then we define $\operatorname{Bk}_T T_i$, the *bark* of T_i with respect to T, as the unique

$\mathbb{Q}$-divisor supported on $\operatorname{Supp} T_i$, such that

$$\operatorname{Bk}_T T_i \cdot R = \beta_T(R) - 2$$

for every component R of T_i, equivalently that $\operatorname{Bk}_T T_i \cdot R$ equals -1 if R is the tip of T contained in T_i and is zero otherwise. Then we define $\operatorname{Bk} T$, the *bark of* T, as the sum of $\operatorname{Bk}_T T_i$'s taken over all maximal twigs of T. Note that if $\alpha\colon (X,T) \to (X', \alpha_* T)$ is the contraction of maximal twigs of T then

$$\alpha^*(K_{X'} + \alpha_* T) = K_X + T - \operatorname{Bk} T.$$

A (-2)-twig is a twig whose all irreducible components are (-2)-curves. A maximal (-2)-twig is a (-2)-twig which is not a proper subdivisor of another (-2)-twig. The following lemma summarizes what we need to know about barks.

Lemma 2.1. *Let T_i be a maximal twig of a rational tree T as above and let T_0 be a component of T_i. Denote the coefficient of T_0 in $\operatorname{Bk} T$ by t_0. Then*

(i) $0 < t_0 < 1$.
(ii) If T_0 is the component meeting $T - T_i$ then $t_0 = \delta(T_i)$.
(iii) $(\operatorname{Bk} T)^2 = -\operatorname{ind}(T)$.
(iv) If there is no (-1)-curve A on X, for which $T \cdot A \leq 1$, then $(K+T)^- = \operatorname{Bk} T$.

Proof. Write $T_i = T_{i,1} + T_{i,2} + \ldots + T_{i,k_i}$, where $T_{i,j}$ are irreducible and $T_{i,j} \cdot T_{i,j+1} = 1$ for $j < k_i$. Then by [9, 2.3.3.4] the coefficient of $T_{i,j}$ in $\operatorname{Bk} T$ equals $d(T_{i,j+1} + \ldots + T_{i,k_i})/d(T_i)$. This gives (i), (ii) and (iii). Part (iv) follows from [3, 6.20]. □

We will often use the logarithmic version of the Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality proved originally by Kobayashi, Nakamura and Sakai. We use the version due to Langer [6]. The following formulation is taken from [14, 2.5]. Recall that a connected reduced divisor D is of *quotient type* if it can be contracted to a quotient singularity. We denote by $\Gamma(D)$ the local fundamental group of the corresponding singular point. For the definition of almost minimality see Section 1.

Lemma 2.2 (The log BMY inequality)**.** *Let (X, D) be a pair consisting of a smooth projective surface X and a reduced snc-divisor D. Let $D_1, \ldots, D_k$ be the connected components of D which are of quotient type. If (X, D) is almost minimal and $\kappa(X \setminus D) \geq 0$ then*

$$\frac{1}{3}(K_X + D - \operatorname{Bk} D)^2 \leq \chi(X \setminus D) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{|\Gamma(D_i)|}.$$

For a pair (X, D) as in the lemma let $\sigma\colon (X', D') \to (X, D)$, where $D' = \sigma_*^{-1} D + \operatorname{Exc} \sigma$, be a blowup with a center on D. Write $\sigma^* D = D' + \mu \operatorname{Exc} \sigma$. We say that σ is *inner (outer)* for D if $\mu = 1$ ($\mu = 0$ respectively). We may equivalently ask that the center of σ belongs to exactly two (one) components of D. If C is an irreducible curve on X' then we say that σ *touches* C if and only if $\operatorname{Exc} \sigma \cdot C \neq 0$. If $\operatorname{Exc} \sigma \cdot C = 1$ we say that σ *touches C once*. In a more general situation, when $\sigma\colon X' \to X$ is a birational morphism from a smooth projective surface we say that σ *touches C n times* if in the decomposition of σ into blowups each time the respective image of C is touched at most once, and is touched n times in total. If we say that two effective divisors on X *meet n times* we simply mean that their intersection number equals n.

By a *log surface* we mean a pair (Y, B) consisting of a projective normal surface Y together with an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, which can be written as $B = \sum b_i B_i$, where B_i are distinct irreducible components and $0 < b_i \leq 1$. It is *smooth* if X is smooth and $\sum B_i$ is an snc-divisor.

Definition 2.3. Let (Y, B) be a log surface and let $\pi\colon (X, D) \to (Y, B)$ be a proper birational morphism from a log surface such that X is smooth and $D = \pi_*^{-1}B + \operatorname{Exc}\pi$. We say that π is a *weak (embedded) resolution of singularities* if $\pi_*^{-1}B$ is an snc-divisor. It is a *log resolution* if D is an snc-divisor (equivalently, (X, D) is a smooth log surface). A log (resp. weak) resolution is a *minimal* log (resp. weak) resolution if it does not dominate any other log (resp. weak) resolution.

2.2. *Rational cuspidal curves*

For a rational curve $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ we put $\kappa_{1/2}(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = \kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}D)$ and $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = h^0(2K_X + D)$, where $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ is the minimal log resolution.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rational cuspidal curve and let $\pi\colon (X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ be any weak resolution of singularities. Put $E = \pi_*^{-1}\bar{E}$. Then:*

(i) $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ *is $\mathbb{Q}$-acyclic.*
(ii) $h^0(2K_X + D) = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$.
(iii) $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ *is Cremona equivalent to a line if and only if* $h^0(2K_X+E) = 0$. *In particular, if $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is not Cremona equivalent to a line then $E^2 \le -4$.*
(iv) If $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is not Cremona equivalent to a line and f is a fiber of any $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration of X then $f \cdot E \ge 4$.
(v) If $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is of log general type then it contains no topologically contractible curves. In case π is the minimal log resolution we have $(K_X + D)^- = \operatorname{Bk} D$.
(vi) Let $\mu(p)$ denote the multiplicity of a point $p \in \bar{E}$. Then

$$\deg \bar{E} < 3 \max\{\mu(p) : p \in \operatorname{Sing} \bar{E}\}.$$

Proof. (i) The $\mathbb{Q}$-acyclicity follows from the Lefschetz duality.

(ii) Let $\sigma\colon X' \to X$ be a blowup and let $D' = \sigma_*^{-1}D + \operatorname{Exc}\sigma$. Let μ be the number of components of D passing through the center of σ. The divisor $D - E$ is snc and E is smooth, so $\mu \le 3$. Clearly, σ_* embeds the linear system of $2K_{X'} + D'$ into the linear system of $\sigma_*(2K_{X'} + D') = 2K_X + D$. Now if $2K_X + D \sim U$ then $2K_{X'} + D' \sim \sigma^*U + (3 - \mu)\operatorname{Exc}\sigma \ge \sigma^*U$, so σ_* is surjective. It follows that $h^0(2K_X + D)$ does not depend on the choice of a weak resolution.

(iii) The first statement is a consequence of [10, 2.4, 2.6] and holds for any rational curve in $\mathbb{P}^2$. If $2K + E \ge 0$ and $E^2 \ge -3$ then $E \cdot (2K + E) = 2E \cdot (K + E) - E^2 = -4 - E^2 < 0$, so E is in the fixed part of $2K + E$, which contradicts the rationality of X.

(iv) Let f be a smooth fiber of a $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration of X. By (ii) and (iii) $h^0(2K_X + E) > 0$, so $0 \le f \cdot (2K_X + E) = -4 + f \cdot E$.

(v) By [8] $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ contains no topologically contractible curves. If π is the minimal log resolution then by 2.1(iv) $(K_X + D)^- = \operatorname{Bk} D$.

(vi) This is the inequality of Matsuoka-Sakai [7]. □

The following result was shown in [13, 2.6]. We recall the proof for completeness.

Proposition 2.5. *If $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is not of log general type then it is $\mathbb{C}^1$- or $\mathbb{C}^*$-fibered and $\kappa_{1/2}(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = -\infty$. In particular, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 0$ and $\bar{E}$ satisfies the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture.*

Proof. Let $S = \mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$. If $\kappa(S) = -\infty$ or 1 then S is $\mathbb{C}^1$- or $\mathbb{C}^*$-fibered by structure theorems for smooth affine surfaces (see [9, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.7.1]), so we may assume $\kappa(S) = 0$. Let (X, D) be the minimal log resolution of $(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$.

Assume first that (X, D) is not almost minimal. Since D is connected, by [3, 6.20] S contains a curve ℓ isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^1$ such that $\kappa(S \setminus \ell) = \kappa(S) = 0$. Since $\operatorname{Pic}(S)$ is

torsion, there is a rational map $f\colon S \dashrightarrow \mathbb{C}^1$ such that $(f) = m\ell$ for some positive integer m. Because S is affine we may assume that f is regular on S, so we get a morphism $f\colon S \to \mathbb{C}^1$. If $f'\colon S \to B$ is its Stein factorization then $\kappa(B - f'(\ell)) \geq \kappa(\mathbb{C}^*) = 0$ and $0 = \kappa(S \setminus \ell) \geq \kappa(F) + \kappa(B - f'(\ell))$ for a general fiber F over $B - f'(\ell)$ by the Kawamata addition theorem [4]. Since $S \setminus \ell$ is not $\mathbb{C}^1$-fibered, we get $\kappa(F) = 0$, so f is a $\mathbb{C}^*$-fibration and we are done.

Suppose now that (X, D) is almost minimal but S is not $\mathbb{C}^*$-fibered. Because $\kappa(S) = 0$, by [3, 8.64] (cf. [9, 3.4.4.2]) $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is one of the three Fujita surfaces $Y\{a, b, c\}$. Then D is a fork whose maximal twigs are (-2)-chains. But then $c = 1$ and there should exist a tip of D (namely E) for which $D - E$ is negative definite. This is not so for the surfaces $Y\{a, b, c\}$, because the branching components have self-intersections $1, 0, -1$ respectively; a contradiction.

Thus S is $\mathbb{C}^1$- or $\mathbb{C}^*$-fibered. The fibration extends to a $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration of some weak resolution $(X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, so that $f \cdot D \leq 2$. But then $\kappa_{1/2}(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = \kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}D) = -\infty$, because $f \cdot (K_X + \frac{1}{2}D) < 0$. It follows that $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = h^0(2K_X + E) = 0$, so we are done due to 2.4(iii). □

Remark 2.6. Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rational curve of degree d which is not Cremona equivalent to a line. The criterion of Kumar-Murthy stated in 2.4(iii) for cuspidal curves works for all rational curves, so $\kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}E) \geq 0$ and therefore $\kappa(K_X + \frac{1}{2}D) \geq 0$. We have the equality $\pi_*(2K_X + E) = 2K_{\mathbb{P}^2} + \bar{E}$, which implies that $d \geq 6$. For a partial converse note that if $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is a general rational curve of degree d then its singularities are ordinary double points (nodes), so we compute easily $2K_X + E \sim (d-6)H$, where H is the pullback of a line on $\mathbb{P}^2$. Thus such $\bar{E}$ is not Cremona equivalent to a line for $d \geq 6$. A general rational sextic with ten nodes is an example of lowest degree. On the other hand, if the singularities of $\bar{E}$ are more complicated than nodes (like for cuspidal curves) determining whether $\bar{E}$ is Cremona equivalent to a line is a more subtle issue.

3. Characteristic pairs

To describe the geometry of exceptional divisors for a resolution of singularities we rely on the Hamburger-Noether pairs. We follow [5, 1.2] (for more details see [15]). Some authors prefer to work with Puiseux expansions and Puiseux pairs, which can be used to do analysis analogous to ours (see [17]). We note that one of the advantages of Hamburger-Noether pairs, aside of their explicit geometric interpretation, is that they can be used when working over fields of positive characteristic.

As an input data take an analytically irreducible germ of a singular curve (χ, q) on a smooth surface and a (germ of a) curve C passing through q, smooth at q. Put $(C_1, \chi_1, q_1) = (C, \chi, q)$, $c_1 = (C_1 \cdot \chi_1)_{q_1}$, where $(\ \cdot\ )_{q_1}$ denotes the local intersection index at q_1, and choose a local coordinate y_1 at q_1 in such a way that $Y_1 = \{y_1 = 0\}$ is transversal to C_1 at q_1 and $p_1 = (Y_1 \cdot \chi_1)_{q_1}$ is not bigger than c_1. Blow up over q_1 until the proper transform χ_2 of χ_1 intersects the reduced total transform of $C_1 + Y_1$ not in a node. Let q_2 be the point of intersection and let C_2 be the last exceptional curve. Put $c_2 = (C_2 \cdot \chi_2)_{q_2}$. We repeat this procedure and we define successively (χ_i, q_i) and C_i until χ_{h+1} is smooth for some $h \geq 1$. This defines a sequence $\binom{c_1}{p_1}, \binom{c_2}{p_2}, \ldots, \binom{c_h}{p_h}$, depending on the choice of C. It follows from the definition that $c_1 \geq p_1$ and that p_1 is the first (and maximal) number in the sequence of multiplicities of $q \in \chi$. Note that the total exceptional divisor contains a unique (-1)-curve.

Because of the forced condition $p_i \leq c_i$ the sequence is usually longer than the sequence of Puiseux pairs. Although it is defined for (and depends on) any initial curve C, in

this article we will choose for C a smooth germ maximally tangent to χ (note that because χ is singular its intersection with smooth germs passing through q is bounded from above). For this choice of C we refer to the sequence $\binom{c_1}{p_1}, \binom{c_2}{p_2}, \ldots, \binom{c_h}{p_h}$ as the sequence of *Hamburger-Noether pairs* (or *characteristic pairs* for short) *of the resolution of* (χ_1, q_1) (as it follows from the definition we refer here to the minimal log resolution). It is convenient to extend the definition to the case when (χ_1, q_1) is smooth by defining its sequence of characteristic pairs to be $\binom{1}{0}$. By $\binom{c}{p}_k$ we mean a sequence of pairs $\binom{c}{p}, \ldots, \binom{c}{p}$ of length k. Let $(\mu_i)_{i\in I_j}$ be the non-increasing sequence of multiplicities of successive centers for the sequence of blowups as above leading from χ_j to χ_{j+1}. The sequence $(\mu_i)_{i\in I_1}, \ldots, (\mu_i)_{i\in I_h}$ is the *multiplicity sequence of the singularity* (χ, q). Note that the composition of blowups corresponding to multiplicities bigger than 1 is the minimal weak resolution of singularities.

Let now $\pi\colon X \to X'$ be a proper birational morphism of smooth surfaces, such that the exceptional divisor $Q = \operatorname{Exc}\pi$ contains a unique (-1)-curve U. If U is not a tip of Q then π is a minimal log resolution of some (germ of a) singular curve χ on X' as above and we define the *sequence of characteristic pairs of* Q to be the one of χ. In case U is a tip of Q let $(X, Q) \to (Y, Q')$ be a composition of a minimal number of contractions, say m, of (-1)-curves in Q and its successive images, such that Q' contains no (-1)-tip. If $(\binom{c_i}{p_i})_{i\le h}$ is the sequence of characteristic pairs for Q' then the sequence of characteristic pairs of Q is by definition $(\binom{c_i}{p_i})_{i\le h}, \binom{1}{1}_m$.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that the sequence of blowups* $(\sigma_j)_{j\in I_i}$*, leading from* (χ_i, q_i) *to* (χ_{i+1}, q_{i+1}) *is described as above by the characteristic pair* $\binom{c_i}{p_i}$*. Let* μ_j *be the multiplicity of the center of* σ_j *as a point on the proper transform on* χ_i*. Then we have:*

(i) $c_{i+1} = gcd(c_i, p_i)$,

(ii) $\sum_{j\in I_i} \mu_j = c_i + p_i - gcd(c_i, p_i)$,

(iii) $\sum_{j\in I_i} \mu_j^2 = c_i p_i$.

Proof. The formulas hold in case $c_i = p_i$. If $c_i > p_i$ then perform the first blowup and note that the remaining part of the sequence $(\sigma_j)_{j\in I_i}$ is described by $\binom{c_i - p_i}{p_i}$ in case $c_i - p_i \ge p_i$ or by $\binom{p_i}{c_i - p_i}$ otherwise. The multiplicity of the first center is p. Now the result follows by induction on $\max(c_i, p_i)$. □

Let $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ be a rational cuspidal curve with cusps $q_1, \ldots, q_c$ and let $\rho\colon (Y, B) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, with $B = \rho_*^{-1}\bar{E} + \operatorname{Exc}\rho$, be a weak resolution of singularities, such that each exceptional divisor $Q_i = \rho^{-1}(q_i)_{red}$ contains a unique (-1)-curve. Put $E_Y = \rho_*^{-1}\bar{E}$. For $i = 1, \ldots, c$ let $\bar{\mu}_i = (\mu_{i,1}, \ldots, \mu_{i,k_i})$ be the multiplicity sequence of $q_i \in \bar{E}$ and its infinitely near points for this resolution. Denote the sequence of characteristic pairs of the divisor Q_i by $(\binom{c_{i,j}}{p_{i,j}})_{j\le h_i}$. Note that the multiplicity of $q_i \in \bar{E}$ is $\mu(q_i) = \mu_{i,1} = p_{i,1}$.

Corollary 3.2. *Assume* E_Y *meets* Q_i *not in a node. Then:*

(i) $\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \mu_{i,j} = (Q_i \cdot E_Y)(c_{i,1} + \sum_{j=1}^{h_i} p_{i,j} - 1)$,

(ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{k_i} \mu_{i,j}^2 = (Q_i \cdot E_Y)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{h_i} c_{i,j} p_{i,j}$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let the situation be as above. Put* $\gamma_Y = -E_Y^2$, $d = \deg \bar{E}$, $\rho_i = Q_i \cdot E_Y$, $M(q_i) = c_{i,1} + \sum_{j=1}^{h_i} p_{i,j} - 1$ *and* $I(q_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{h_i} c_{i,j}p_{i,j}$. *Then*

(i) $\gamma_Y - 2 + 3d = \sum_i \rho_i M(q_i)$,

(ii) $\gamma_Y + d^2 = \sum_i \rho_i^2 I(q_i)$,

(iii) $(d-1)(d-2) = \sum_i \rho_i(\rho_i I(q_i) - M(q_i))$.

Note that (iii) is the genus-degree formula written in terms of characteristic pairs.

Proof. Let $C \subseteq X$ be an irreducible curve on a smooth projective surface. Let $p \in C$ be a singular point of C having multiplicity m and let $\sigma\colon X' \to X$ be a blowup at p. Denote the exceptional curve by L and the proper transform of C on X' by C'. Then

$$K_X \cdot C = \sigma^* K_X \cdot C' = (K_{X'} - L) \cdot C' = K'_X \cdot C' - m$$

and

$$C^2 = \sigma^* C \cdot C' = (C' + mL) \cdot C' = C'^2 + m^2.$$

This implies that if in the lemma $\rho_i = 1$ then the sum of all multiplicities $\mu_{i,j}$ equals $K_Y \cdot E_Y - K_{\mathbb{P}^2} \cdot \bar{E} = \gamma_Y - 2 + 3d$ and the sum of their squares equals $\bar{E}^2 - E_Y^2 = d^2 + \gamma_Y$. The general case follows by the linearity of multiplicity with respect to addition of germs. This proves (i) and (ii); (iii) is their consequence. □

Example 3.4. If $Q_i = [2,1,3]$ then $h_i = 1$, $\binom{c_{i,1}}{p_{i,1}} = \binom{3}{2}$, $M(q_i) = 4$ and $I(q_i) = 6$. If $Q_i = [5,2,1,3,2,2,3]$ then $h_i = 1$, $\binom{c_{i,1}}{p_{i,1}} = \binom{16}{9}$, $M(q_i) = 24$ and $I(q_i) = 144$. The multiplicity sequence for a cusp with $Q_i = [2,1,3]$ is $(2,1,1)$. For $Q_i = [3,1,2,3]$ it is $(3,2,1,1)$, for $Q_i = [n,1,(2)_{n-2},3]$ it is $(n, n-1, (1)_{n-1})$ and for $Q_i = [5,2,1,3,2,2,3]$ it is $(9,7,(2)_3,(1)_2)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let* Q *be a rational chain created by the characteristic pair* $\binom{c}{p}$ *and let* L *be the unique* (-1)*-curve of* Q. *Write* $Q - L = A + B$, *where* A *and* B *are disjoint and connected with* $d(A) \geq d(B)$. *Put* $B = 0$ *if* $p = 1$. *Let* A_L, B_L *be the tips of* Q *which are components of* A *and* B *respectively. Write* $c = q \cdot p + r$ *for some integers* $q > 0$ *and* $0 \leq r < p$. *Then*

$$d(A) = c,\ d(B) = p,\ d(A - A_L) = c - p \quad \text{and} \quad d(B - B_L) = p - r.$$

Moreover, if we treat A *and* B *as twigs of* Q *then*

$$\operatorname{ind}(A) + \operatorname{ind}(B) = \frac{c-p}{c} + \frac{p-r}{p} > 1 - \frac{1}{q+1} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. For an (ordered) rational chain $T = T_1 + \ldots + T_n$ we put $d'(T) = d(T - T_1)$ if $n > 0$ and $d'(T) = 0$ if $n = 0$. As a consequence of elementary properties of determinants we have a recurrence formula computing the discriminant

$$d(T) = (-T_1^2) \cdot d(T - T_1) - d'(T - T_1).$$

We assume that A and B are ordered so that the tips of Q are their first components. We prove the four formulas for discriminants by induction on the length of Q. Let $\psi\colon X \to X'$ be a birational morphism for which $\operatorname{Exc}\psi = Q$ and let σ be the blowup with the center $\psi(Q)$. Decompose ψ as $\psi = \sigma \circ \psi'$ and let $Q' = \operatorname{Exc}\psi'$. The proper transform U of $\operatorname{Exc}\sigma$ is a component of A which is a tip of Q. We have $Q - U = Q'$. If $q > 1$ then U

is a (-2)-curve and Q' is created by the characteristic pair $\binom{c-p}{p}$. Then by the inductive assumption we have $d(A-A_L)=c-p$, $d(B)=p$ and $d(B-B_L)=p-r$. We compute also

$$d(A)=2d(A-U)-d'(A-U)=2(c-p)-(c-2p)=c,$$

so we are done. Assume $q=1$. Let q' and r' be the quotient and the remainder of dividing p by $c-p$. Then U is a $-(q'+2)$-curve and Q' is created by the characteristic pair $\binom{p}{c-p}$. By the inductive assumption $d(B)=p$, $d(B-B_L)=p-(c-p)=p-r$ and $d(A-A_L)=c-p$. We compute

$$d(A)=(q'+2)(c-p)-(c-p-r')=q'(c-p)+r'+(c-p)=c.$$

We have

$$\frac{c-p}{c}+\frac{p-r}{p}>1-\frac{1}{q+1}\Leftrightarrow\frac{p-r}{p}+\frac{1}{q+1}>\frac{p}{c}\Leftrightarrow\frac{(p-r)(q+1)+p}{p}>\frac{c-r+p}{c}\Leftrightarrow$$
$$\Leftrightarrow\frac{(p-r)(q+1)}{p}>\frac{p-r}{c}\Leftrightarrow\frac{c}{p}>\frac{1}{q+1}.$$

But $\frac{c}{p}>1>\frac{1}{q+1}$, so we are done. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let Q be a rational chain which contracts to a smooth point and which contains a unique (-1)-curve. Let k denote a non-negative integer.*

(i) If $K\cdot Q<0$ then $Q=[(2)_k,1]$.
(ii) If $K\cdot Q=0$ then $Q=[(2)_k,3,1,2]$.
(iii) If $K\cdot Q=1$ then $Q=[(2)_k,4,1,2,2]$ or $Q=[(2)_k,3,2,1,3]$.
(iv) If $K\cdot Q=2$ then $Q=[(2)_k,5,1,2,2,2]$ or $Q=[(2)_k,4,2,1,3,2]$ or $Q=[(2)_k,3,3,1,2,3]$ or $Q=[(2)_k,3,2,2,1,4]$.

Proof. If $\#Q=1$ then $Q=[1]$, so $K\cdot Q=-1$. Let σ be a blowup with a center on Q and let Q' be its reduced total transform. If the blowup is outer then $K\cdot Q'=K\cdot Q$. It the blowup is inner then $K\cdot Q'=K\cdot Q+1$. Therefore, every chain with $K\cdot Q=\alpha\geq 0$ can be obtained from some chain with $K\cdot Q=\alpha-1$ by blowing up once. Clearly, for inner blowups there are two possible choices of the center. □

More generally, we have the following description.

Lemma 3.7. *Every rational chain Q which contracts to a smooth point and which contains a unique (-1)-curve is of the following type:*

$$[m_{2k}+3,(2)_{m_{2k-1}},\dots,m_2+3,(2)_{m_1},1,m_1+2,(2)_{m_2},m_3+3,\dots,m_{2k-1}+3,(2)_{m_{2k}},3,(2)_x]$$

for some integers $k\geq 1$, $x\geq -1$ and $m_1,\dots,m_{2k}\geq 0$ or

$$[(2)_{m_{2k}},m_{2k-1}+3,\dots,m_3+3,(2)_{m_2},m_1+2,1,(2)_{m_1},m_2+3,\dots,(2)_{m_{2k-1}},m_{2k}+3,(2)_x]$$

for some integers $k,x\geq 0$ and $m_1,\dots,m_{2k}\geq 0$. By definition $[3,(2)_{-1}]=\emptyset$.

Proof. Induction with respect to the length of the chain. □

4. Minimal models

From now on we assume that $\bar{E}\subseteq\mathbb{P}^2$ is a rational cuspidal curve, $\pi_0\colon(X_0,D_0)\to(\mathbb{P}^2,\bar{E})$ is the minimal weak resolution of singularities and $\pi\colon(X,D)\to(\mathbb{P}^2,\bar{E})$ is the minimal log resolution. We assume also that $\bar{E}\subseteq\mathbb{P}^2$ violates the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture, i.e. it is not Cremona equivalent to a line. By 2.5 and 2.4(iii) $\mathbb{P}^2\setminus\bar{E}$ is a surface of log general type and $2K+E\geq 0$, where K denotes the canonical divisor on X. In particular, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2,\bar{E})=h^0(2K+D)\geq 1$. Clearly, we have a factorization $\psi_0\colon(X,D)\to(X_0,D_0)$.

Our method to analyze $(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ is to run the logarithmic Minimal Model Program for $(X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0)$, which is described by α_0 and the lower row in the diagram below. But since the surfaces Y_i are singular it is worth keeping track of lifts of extremal contractions of rays not contained in the boundary on the level of minimal weak and log resolutions dominating successive surfaces produced by the program (the upper and middle rows of the diagram). The analysis is an analog of the theory of peeling [9, 2.3] (which works for reduced boundaries).

4.1. *Review of the log MMP for* $(X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0)$

The outcome of the construction in [13, §3] is the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & (X, D) & \xrightarrow{\psi_1'} & (X_1', D_1') & \xrightarrow{\psi_2'} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\psi_n'} & (X_n', D_n') \\
 & \overset{\pi}{\swarrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi_0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_1} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_n} \\
(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) & \xleftarrow[\pi_0]{} & (X_0, D_0) & \xrightarrow{\psi_1} & (X_1, D_1) & \xrightarrow{\psi_2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\psi_n} & (X_n, D_n) \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_1} & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_n} \\
 & & (Y_0, D_{Y_0}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_1''} & (Y_1, D_{Y_1}) & \xrightarrow{\psi_2''} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\psi_n''} & (Y_n, D_{Y_n})
\end{array}$$

Let us recall the necessary definitions and results. Write K_i (resp. K_i') for the canonical divisor on X_i (resp. on X_i'). Let φ_i, $i \geq 0$ be the minimal log resolution of (X_i, D_i). We have $\varphi_0 = \psi_0$. The morphism $\alpha_i \colon (X_i, D_i) \to (Y_i, D_{Y_i})$ is the composition of successive extremal birational contractions of curves with support in D_i which are negative with respect to $K_i + \frac{1}{2}D_i$ (and its successive pushforwards). The one-step description of $\alpha_i \colon X_i \to Y_i$ is that it is the contraction of $\Delta_i + \Upsilon_i$, where Δ_i is the sum of all maximal (-2)-twigs of D_i and Υ_i is the sum of (-1)-curves L in D_i, for which either $\beta_{D_i}(L) = 3$ and $L \cdot \Delta_i = 1$ or $\beta_{D_i}(L) = 2$ and L meets exactly one component of D_i. Write $\Delta_i = \Delta_i^+ + \Delta_i^-$, where Δ_i^+ consists of these (-2)-twigs of D_i which meet Υ_i. It is known that the components of Υ_i are disjoint, so each connected component of Δ_i^+ meets exactly one component of Υ_i. We put

$$\operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_i^- = \operatorname{Bk}_{D_i}(\Delta_i^-)$$

(see Section 2), i.e. $\operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_i^-$ is the unique (effective, fractional) $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor supported on $\operatorname{Supp} \Delta_i^-$ such that for every component R of Δ_i^- we have $(K_i + D_i - \operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_i^-) \cdot R = 0$, equivalently $\operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_i^- \cdot R$ equals -1 if R is the tip of D_i contained in Δ_i^- and is 0 otherwise. One computes

$$\alpha_i^*(K_{Y_i} + \frac{1}{2}D_{Y_i}) = K_i + \frac{1}{2}D_i^\flat, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$D_i^\flat = D_i - \Upsilon_i - \Delta_i^+ - \operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_i^-.$$

Now the log MMP works so that either $(Y_i, \frac{1}{2}D_i)$ is a log Mori fiber space (which in our case is impossible, because of the inequality $\kappa(K + \frac{1}{2}D) \geq 0$) or $K_{Y_i} + \frac{1}{2}D_{Y_i}$ is nef, and then we put $i = n$ (the process stops), or there is an extremal $(K_{Y_i} + \frac{1}{2}D_{Y_i})$-negative contraction $\theta_i \colon Y_i \to Z$ which is birational. Consider the latter case. We denote the proper transform of $\operatorname{Exc} \theta_i$ on X_i by A_i. We have $(K_i + \frac{1}{2}D_i^\flat) \cdot A_i < 0$. Because of the negativity of the contracted locus the existence of the contraction θ_i implies ([13, Corollary 3.5]) that

$$A_i \cdot (\Upsilon_i + \Delta_i^+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad A_i \cdot (D_i - \Delta_i^-) = A_i \cdot \Delta_i^- = 1 \tag{4.2}$$

and that the component of Δ_i^- meeting A_i is a tip of Δ_i^- (but not necessarily a tip of D_i). What is crucial, A_i is a (-1)-curve whose affine part, i.e. $A_i \cap (X_i \setminus D_i)$, is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^*$. Finally, $\psi_{i+1}\colon (X_i, D_i) \to (X_{i+1}, D_{i+1})$, with $D_{i+1} = \psi_{i*}D_i$, is by definition the composition of successive contractions of superfluous (-1)-curves in $D_i + A_i$ and its images starting from A_i. Because A_i meets two components of D_i, the contractions are inner with respect to $D_i + A_i$. It follows that

$$\psi_{i+1}^*(K_{i+1} + D_{i+1}) = K_i + D_i + A_i. \tag{4.3}$$

We say that ψ_{i+1} is of *type II* if it contracts both components of D_i meeting A_i; otherwise it is of *type I*. In any case, all components of D_i contracted by ψ_{i+1} are contained in maximal twigs meeting A_i. The morphism $\psi'_{i+1}\colon (X'_i, D'_i) \to (X'_{i+1}, D'_{i+1})$ is a lift of ψ_i and the morphism $\psi''_{i+1}\colon (Y_i, D_{Y_i}) \to (Y_{i+1}, D_{Y_{i+1}})$ comes by factorizing $\alpha_{i+1} \circ \psi_{i+1}$ through α_i. We put $\psi = \psi_n \circ \ldots \circ \psi_1\colon (X_0, D_0) \to (X_n, D_n)$.

Definition 4.1. The pairs $(Y_n, \frac{1}{2}D_{Y_n})$ and $(X'_n, \frac{1}{2}D'_n)$ constructed above are called a *minimal model* and respectively an *almost minimal model* of $(X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0)$.

Let E and E_i for $i \geq 0$ be the proper transforms of $\bar{E}$ on X and on X_i respectively. By construction X_i and E_i are smooth and $D_i - E_i$ is an snc-divisor. Although D_i is not snc, it has smooth components and contains no superfluous (-1)-curves. Recall that by [13, 4.1(viii)] the process of minimalization ψ does not affect $h^0(m(2K_i + D_i))$, i.e.

$$h^0(m(2K_i + D_i)) = h^0(m(2K + D)).$$

Also, the behaviour of Δ and Υ under ψ is well understood. First of all, $\psi_{(i+1)*}(\Upsilon_i)$ is a subdivisor of Υ_{i+1}. If A_i meets Δ_i^- not in a tip of D_i then ψ_{i+1} contracts only A_i (hence is of type I) and we have $b_0(\Delta_{i+1}) = b_0(\Delta_i)$ and $b_0(\Delta_{i+1}^+) = b_0(\Delta_i^+) + 1$. If A_i meets Δ_i^- in a tip of D_i then ψ_{i+1} contracts at least A_i and the connected component of Δ_i^- meeting A_i (with a minor exception when this connected component and A_i meet the same irreducible component of $D_i - \Delta_i^-$). In the latter case $b_0(\Delta_{i+1}) = b_0(\Delta_i) - 1$ and either $b_0(\Delta_{i+1}^+) = b_0(\Delta_i^+)$ or $b_0(\Delta_{i+1}^+) = b_0(\Delta_i^+) + 1$.

Denote the cusps of $\bar{E}$ by $q_1, \ldots, q_c$. We introduce the following numbers characterizing the geometry of the boundary. Assume $j \in \{1, \ldots, c\}$. We write τ_j for the number of times ψ_0 touches E. Equivalently, τ_j is the number of curves over the cusp q_j contracted by ψ_0. We put $s_j = 1$ if ψ_0 contains (in a decomposition into blowdowns) a contraction over q_j which is outer for $D - E$ and $s_j = 0$ otherwise. Put $\tau_j^* = \tau_j - s_j - 1$ (since $\tau_j \geq 2$ we have $\tau_j^* \geq 0$), $\tau^* = \sum_{j=1}^{c} \tau_j^*$ and $s = \sum_{j=1}^{c} s_j$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let (X_i, D_i), (X'_i, D'_i) and ψ_i, $i = 0, \ldots, n$ be as above.*

(i) D'_i is snc-minimal,
(ii) $K \cdot (K + D) = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$,
(iii) $\#D_i = \rho(X_i) + i$ for $i \geq 0$,
(iv) $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + i + \operatorname{ind}(D'_i) \leq 5$. In particular, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 4$.
(v) For every component U of $D_i - \Delta_i$ we have $U \cdot \Delta_i \leq 1$.
(vi) For every component U of $D_0 - E_0$

$$\psi(U) \cdot E_n \leq U \cdot E_0 + 1.$$

If the equality holds then the unique ψ_i increasing the intersection of the images of U and E_0 is of type I. Moreover, it touches U exactly once and either U is the component of Δ_0^- met by A_{i-1} or there is a unique connected component of Δ_0^- meeting U and this component is contracted by ψ_i.

Proof. The proof of part (i) given in [13, 3.7] for D'_n works for any i. For (ii)-(iii), (v) and (vi) see [13, 4.3(i),(ii) and 4.1(vi),(vii)] respectively. We note that (ii) is based on the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem.

(iv) The log resolution $\varphi_n\colon (X'_i, D'_i) \to (X_i, D_i)$ does not touch A_i, so A'_i, the proper transform of A_i on X'_i, is a (-1)-curve. The equation (4.3) implies $(\psi'_{i+1})^*(K'_{i+1}+D'_{i+1}) = K'_i + D'_i + A'_i$, hence $(K'_{i+1} + D'_{i+1})^2 = (K'_i + D'_i)^2 + 1$. Then (ii) gives $(K'_i + D'_i)^2 = (K + D)^2 + i = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + i - 2$. Put $\mathcal{P}_i = (K'_i + D'_i)^+$. The surface $X_i \setminus D_i$ contains no $\mathbb{C}^1$, because $X \setminus D$ contains none. By (i) and 2.1(iii) we obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_i^2 = (K'_i + D'_i)^2 + \operatorname{ind}(D'_i) = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + i - 2 + \operatorname{ind}(D'_i).$$

Because $A_i \cap (X_i \setminus D_i) \cong \mathbb{C}^*$, we have $\chi(X_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}) = \chi(X_i \setminus D_i)$. The logarithmic Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality gives $\mathcal{P}_i^2 \le 3\chi(X'_i \setminus D'_i) = 3\chi(X \setminus D) = 3$. □

We say the cusp $q_j \in \bar{E}$ is *semi-ordinary* if it is locally analytically isomorphic to the singular point of $x^2 = y^{2m+1}$ at $0 \in \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ for some $m \ge 1$. Let c_0 and c_1 be the numbers of semi-ordinary and non-semi-ordinary cusps of $\bar{E}$ respectively. Note that $\#\Upsilon_0 = c_0$. Put $\eta = \#\Upsilon_n - \#\Upsilon_0$. For $k = 0, 1$ let n_k be the number of contracted A_i's, i.e. the (-1)-curves defined above, for which $A_i \cdot E_i = k$. By (4.2) $n = n_0 + n_1$. By [13, 4.3])

$$K_n \cdot (K_n + D_n) = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - c - \tau^* - n \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$E_n \cdot (K_n + D_n) = 2c - 2 + \tau^* + n_1. \tag{4.5}$$

4.2. *The log MMP and the Cremona equivalence*

The assumption that $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is not Cremona equivalent to a line, or equivalently that $2K_X + E \ge 0$, was not used in the construction above. Now it will allow us to analyze D_n and the process of minimalization in more detail. For example if we intersect $2K_n + E_n$, which is effective, with $\alpha_n^*(K_{Y_n} + \frac{1}{2}D_{Y_n})$, which is nef, we get a non-negative number (see 4.4(i) for the resulting inequality).

Let C_j be the (-1)-curve of $D_0 - E_0$ over q_j and let $\mathcal{C} = C_1 + \ldots + C_c$. All C_j are tangent to E_0, so are not contracted by ψ. Denote their images on X_n by $C'_1, \ldots, C'_c$. Let $\mathcal{C}_+$ and $\mathcal{C}_{exc}$ be the sums of these C'_j's whose self-intersection is non-negative and equal to (-1) respectively. Clearly, $\psi_*(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}_+ + \mathcal{C}_{exc}$. In the process of minimalization ψ some new non-superfluous (-1)-curves might have been created in the boundary. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the sum of (-1)-curves of $D_n - E_n$ which are not components of $\mathcal{C}_{exc}$. Put $n_{exc} = \#\mathcal{L}$. We say that a (-1)-curve L in $D_i - E_i$ (and its image in $D_n - E_n$, if it belongs to $\mathcal{L}$) is *created by* ψ_i if and only if $\psi_{i*}^{-1}(L)$ is not a (-1)-curve. Put

$$R_n = D_n - E_n - \mathcal{C}_+ - \mathcal{C}_{exc} - \mathcal{L}.$$

Note that if L is a common component of $\mathcal{L}$ and Υ_n then $L' = \psi_*^{-1}(L)$ is not a component of $\mathcal{C}$, which implies that $L \cdot E_n \le 1$. Indeed, otherwise 4.2 gives $L' \cdot E_0 \ne 0$, so $L' \cdot E_0 = L' \cdot C_j = 1$ for some j and hence $L \cdot (D_n - \Delta_n) \ge L \cdot (C'_j + E_n) \ge 3$, which contradicts the definition of Υ_n. Therefore, we may decompose $\eta = \#\Upsilon_n - \#\Upsilon_0$, introduced above, as $\eta = \eta_0 + \eta_1$, where for $k = 0, 1$ the number η_k counts the common components of $\mathcal{L}$ and Υ_n which meet E_n exactly k times.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume $1 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le j \le c$. The following hold.*

(i) *Let $L \subseteq X_n$ be the image of a (-1)-curve in $D_i - E_i$ created by some ψ_i, $i \geq 1$ and let M be a component of $D_n - E_n - L$ with $m = -M^2$ and $u = L \cdot M > 0$. Then $L \leq \mathcal{L}$ and if $m \leq u^2$ then $M \cdot E_n + 2m \geq 4 + (2 - L \cdot E_n)u$.*

(ii) *Each ψ_i creates at most one (-1)-curve.*

(iii) *The components of $\mathcal{L}$ are disjoint and $n_{exc} \leq n \leq 4$.*

(iv) *For $k = 0, 1$ we have $\eta_k \leq n_k$.*

(v) *Components of R_n intersect non-negatively with K_n.*

(vi) *If $(C'_j)^2 \geq 0$ then $K_n \cdot C'_j + \tau_j^* \geq 0$.*

(vii) *Assume ψ_i creates a (-1)-curve L in $D_i - E_i$. Then for every component V of $D_i - E_i - L$ we have $V \cdot E_i = \psi_{i*}^{-1}(V) \cdot E_{i-1}$. If $L \cdot E_i \neq \psi_{i*}^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0$ then $A_{i-1} \cdot E_{i-1} = 1$, $L \cdot E_n = \psi_*^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0 + 1$ and ψ_i contracts either A_{i-1} or A_{i-1} together with a (-2)-twig of D_{i-1} meeting $\psi_{i*}^{-1}(L)$.*

Proof. (i) Note that once ψ_i creates a (-1)-curve L, this curve is not touched by ψ_j for $j > i$. Indeed, otherwise by 4.2(vi) the first blowdown touching L makes it into a 0-curve intersecting the image of E_0 at most twice, which contradicts 2.4(iv). Put $\mu = 2 - L \cdot E_n$ and $f = uL + M$. By 4.2(vi) $\mu \geq 0$. We have $f \cdot L = 0$ and $f \cdot M = u^2 - m \geq 0$, so f is nef. Because $2K_0 + E_0 \geq 0$, we have $2K_n + E_n \geq 0$. But μL is in the fixed part of $|2K_n + E_n|$, so $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n - \mu L) = M \cdot (2K_n + E_n - \mu L) = 2(m-2) + M \cdot E_n - \mu u$, which is equivalent to the inequality (i).

(ii)-(iii) Since for $i \geq 1$ the morphism ψ_i is a composition of blowdowns which are inner for $D_{i-1} + A_{i-1}$, we see that it can create at most two (-1)-curves. Suppose two components L_1, L_2 of $\mathcal{L}$ meet. (This is for example the case if some ψ_i creates more than one (-1)-curve.) For $j = 1, 2$ let L'_j be the proper transform of L_j on X_0. Since L'_j is not a (-1)-curve, we have $L'_j \cdot E_0 \leq 1$, so by 4.2(vi) $L_j \cdot E_n \leq L'_j \cdot E_0 + 1 \leq 2$. Since $L_1 + L_2$ is nef, by 2.4(iii) $4 \leq (L_1 + L_2) \cdot E_n$, which implies $L_1 \cdot E_n = L_2 \cdot E_n = 2$ and hence $L'_1 \cdot E_0 = L'_2 \cdot E_0 = 1$. Therefore L'_j's lie over different cusps. It follows also that for $j = 1, 2$ there exists ψ_{m_j}, which increases the intersection of the image of L'_j with the image of E_0. But then $A_{m_1 - 1}$ and $A_{m_2 - 1}$, and hence their proper transforms on $\pi(X) = \mathbb{P}^2$ are disjoint; a contradiction. Thus each ψ_i creates at most one (-1)-curve and these (-1)-curves remain disjoint on X_n. We have $n \leq 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 4$ by 4.2(iv).

(iv) Fix $i \geq 1$. Assume U is a component of $D_{i-1} - E_{i-1} - \Upsilon_{i-1}$ such that $\psi_i(U)$ is a component of Υ_i. By (ii) it is enough to show that A_{i-1} meets E_{i-1} if and only if $\psi_i(U)$ meets E_i. Since $\psi_{j*}\Upsilon_{j-1} \leq \Upsilon_j$, the image of U on X_n is a component of Υ_n and in particular $\psi_i(U)$ is not touched by ψ_j with $j > i$. If $A_{i-1} \cdot E_{i-1} = 1$ then ψ_i contracts either only A_i or A_i and a connected component of Δ_{i-1}^- meeting it. In both cases $\psi_i(U)$ meets E_i. Suppose $A_{i-1} \cdot E_{i-1} = 0$ and $\psi_i(U) \cdot E_i > 0$. Since $\psi_i(U)$ is a component of Υ_i, the proper transform U_0 of U on X_0 does not meet E_0. Indeed, otherwise it would also meet some C_j and a (-2)-twig of D_0 not touched by ψ, which implies $\beta_{D_i}(U) > 3$, in contradiction to the definition of Υ_i. Thus some ψ_j with $j < i$ increases the intersection of images of U_0 and E_0, so by 4.2(vi) ψ_j contracts some (-2)-twig of D_{j-1} meeting U_0. Note that the image of U_0 on X_j is not a (-1)-curve. Because $\psi_i(U)$ meets E_i transversally and is not superfluous, we have $\beta_{D_i}(\psi_i(U)) \geq 3$. Because $\psi_i(U)$ is a component of Υ_i, it follows that U_0 meets more than one (-2)-twig of D_0; a contradiction with 4.2(v).

(v)-(vi) Let L be a component of $R_n + \mathcal{C}_+$ with $K_n \cdot L < 0$. By definition L is not a (-1)-curve, so $L^2 \geq 0$. We blow up L^2 times on L and we denote the proper transforms of L and E by L' and E' respectively. Now L' induces a $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration of the blowup, and by 2.4(iii) $L' \cdot E' \geq 4$. By 4.2 this can happen only if $\psi_*^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0 \geq 3$, so $L = C'_j$ for some j, say $j = 1$. We get $4 \leq L' \cdot E' = L \cdot E_n - L^2 \leq C_1 \cdot E_0 + 1 - L^2$, so $\tau_1^* + K_n \cdot C'_1 \geq -s_1$.

Suppose $\tau_1^* + K_n \cdot C_1' < 0$. Then $s_1 = 1$ and all the inequalities become equalities, so $\tau_1^* + K_n \cdot C_1' = -1$ and $C_1' \cdot E_n = C_1 \cdot E_0 + 1$, which implies that C_1 meets some (-2)-twig of D_0. Since $s_1 = 1$, C_1 together with this (-2)-twig is a connected component of $D_0 - E_0$. Moreover, ψ touches C_1 once, exactly when contracting this (-2)-twig together with some A_{i_0} intersecting it in a tip. But this A_{i_0} does not meet the exceptional divisor over cusps other than q_1, so $\pi_0(A_{i_0})$ is a 0-curve on $\mathbb{P}^2$; a contradiction.

(vii) Assume $V \cdot E_i > \psi_{i*}^{-1}(V) \cdot E_{i-1}$ for some component V of $D_i - E_i$. By 4.2(ii) $A_{i-1} \cdot E_{i-1} = 1$, ψ_i is of type I and $V = L$, so ψ_i touches $L' = \psi_{i*}^{-1}(L)$ once. Furthermore, either L' is a part of a (-2)-twig of D_{i-1} and A_{i-1} meets L' or L' and A_{i-1} meet the same maximal (-2)-twig of D_{i-1}. By 4.2(v) for a given V this increase of the intersection with the image of E_0 can happen for at most one ψ_i. □

The proof of Theorem 1.1, given in the next section, is rather lengthy and requires ruling out some very concrete types of cuspidal curves. The basic role in reducing the proof to these cases is played by the following proposition. For $i = 0, \ldots, n$ put $\gamma_i = -E_i^2$ and $\gamma = -E^2$. Recall that by 2.4(iii) $2K_i + E_i \geq 0$, so $\gamma_i \geq 4$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let the notation be as above. Put $\zeta = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n)$. Then:*

(i) $\gamma_n + \tau^* + (n_1 - \eta_1) + 2(n_0 - \eta_0) \leq 2\zeta + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$,

(ii)

$$\sum_{j:C_j' \leq \mathcal{C}_+} (K_n \cdot C_j' + \tau_j^*) + \#\mathcal{C}_+ + \sum_{j:C_j \leq \mathcal{C}_{exc}} \tau_j^* + (n - n_{exc}) + K_n \cdot R_n = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \zeta.$$

Proof. By construction the divisor $2K_n + D_n^\flat$ is nef, so

$$0 \leq (2K_n + D_n^\flat) \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = (2K_n + D_n) \cdot (2K_n + E_n) - \Upsilon_n \cdot (2K_n + E_n).$$

We have

$$\Upsilon_n \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = \Upsilon_0 \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) - 2\eta_0 - \eta_1 = -2\eta_0 - \eta_1$$

and

$$(2K_n + D_n) \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = 2\zeta - K_n \cdot E_n + 2K_n \cdot (K_n + D_n) + E_n \cdot (K_n + D_n).$$

By (4.4) and (4.5) the latter expression equals $2\zeta - \gamma_n + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \tau^* - n_1 - 2n_0$, which proves (i). We have

$$K_n \cdot \sum_j C_j' = K_n \cdot \mathcal{C}_+ - (c - \#\mathcal{C}_+) \quad \text{and} \quad K_n \cdot \mathcal{L} = -n_{exc}.$$

By (4.4) $K_n \cdot (D_n - E_n) + \zeta + \tau^* + c + n = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, which leads to (ii). □

Let us now transfer some results to the level of (X_n', D_n'). Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the sum of the (-1)-curves of D. Note that these are exactly the components of $D - E$ meeting E. By the definition of ψ and φ_n, they are not touched by $\psi' \colon (X, D) \to (X_n', D_n')$, i.e. their images are (-1)-curves in D_n'. Let $\mathcal{L}'$ be the sum of (-1)-curves in $D_n' - E_n' - \psi_*'(\mathcal{U})$, put $n_{exc}' = \#\mathcal{L}'$. As in 4.3(iii) we have $n_{exc}' \leq n$. Put $R_n' = D_n' - E_n' - \psi_*'(\mathcal{U}) - \mathcal{L}'$.

Corollary 4.5. *Let the notation be as above. The almost minimal model $(X_n', \frac{1}{2}D_n')$ of $(X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0)$ has the following properties:*

(i) Components of R_n' intersect K_n' non-negatively,

(ii) $K_n' \cdot (K_n' + E_n') = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) = \zeta$,

(iii) $K_n' \cdot R_n' = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \zeta - n + n_{exc}' + c$,

(iv) $2 \leq \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_n + \tau^*) \leq \zeta + p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$,

(v) $\rho(X_n') \leq 8 + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + c + s + \zeta \leq 20 + 2c$,

(vi) $\#D'_n \le 8 + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + c + s + \zeta + n \le 24 + 2c$.

Proof. (i) By definition R'_n contains no (-1)-curves. Let W be a component of R'_n with $W^2 \ge 0$. Lemma 4.2(vi) implies that $W \cdot E'_n \le (\psi')^{-1}_*(W) \cdot E + 1 = 1$, so after blowing up on W until $W^2 = 0$ we get a $\mathbb{P}^1$-ruled surface for which the proper transform of E meets a general fiber at most once. This contradicts 2.4(iv).

(ii) The centers of all blowups constituting φ_n belong to respective proper transforms of E, so $\varphi_n^*(K_n + E_n) = K'_n + E'_n$, hence $K'_n \cdot (K'_n + E'_n) = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) = \zeta$.

(iii) We have $K'_n \cdot (K'_n + D'_n) = K \cdot (K + D) - n = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - n$ by 4.2(ii), hence by (ii) $K'_n \cdot R'_n = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - n + n'_{exc} + c - \zeta$.

(iv) By 4.4(i) $\zeta + p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \ge \frac{1}{2}(\gamma_n + \tau^*)$. By (ii) and by the Riemann-Roch theorem $\zeta \le h^0(2K'_n + E'_n) = h^0(2K + E) \le p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$.

(v) We have $K'_n \cdot E'_n = K_n \cdot E_n + \tau = \gamma_n - 2 + \tau$, so by the Noether formula $\zeta = (K'_n)^2 + K'_n \cdot E'_n = 8 - \rho(X'_n) + \gamma_n + \tau$. Now 4.4(i) gives $\zeta + 8 + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \rho(X'_n) \ge -c - s$.

(vi) follows from (v) and from the equality $\#D'_n = \rho(X'_n) + n$ (see 4.2(iii)). □

For $j = 1, \ldots, c$ let Q_j be the reduced exceptional divisor of $\pi\colon X \to \mathbb{P}^2$ over the cusp $q_j \in \bar{E}$ and let $\widetilde{Q}_j = \psi_0(Q_j)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume the cusps $q_2, \ldots, q_c \in \bar{E}$ have multiplicity two (equivalently, they are semi-ordinary). Then q_1 has multiplicity at least four.*

Proof. Let $\mu(q_j)$ denote the multiplicity of $q_j \in \bar{E}$. If $j \ge 2$ then, because $\mu(q_j) = 2$, the divisor $\widetilde{Q}_j$ is a chain of type $[(2)_{t_j - 1}, 1]$ for some $t_j \ge 1$. Suppose $\mu(q_1) \le 3$.

Claim. $\mu(q_1) \ne 2$.

Suppose $\mu(q_1) = 2$. If $n \ne 0$ then $D_0 - E_0 + A_0$ contains a chain of type $f = [1, 2, \ldots, 2, 1]$ meeting E_0 at most three times. But f is nef, so by 2.4(iii) $0 \le f \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = -4 + f \cdot E_0$; a contradiction. Thus $n = 0$ and so 4.4 gives $K_0 \cdot (K_0 + E_0) = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ and $\gamma_0 \le 4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. By 4.2(iv) $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \le 4$. The Noether formula gives $\#D_0 = \rho(X_0) = 10 - K_0^2 = 8 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. For the resolution $X_0 \to \mathbb{P}^2$ all multiplicities of singular points of $\bar{E}$ are equal to 2, so the genus-degree formula gives

$$\frac{1}{2}(\deg \bar{E} - 1)(\deg \bar{E} - 2) = \#(D_0 - E_0) = 7 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \le 19.$$

The solutions are $(\deg \bar{E}, \#(D_0 - E_0)) = (6, 10)$ and $(7, 15)$. These configurations have been ruled out by Yoshihara [16] by analyzing cohomology of double covers of $\mathbb{P}^2$ branched along $\bar{E}$ and $\bar{E} \cup$ (tangent to $\bar{E}$) respectively. In fact we could refer here to the inequality of Matsuoka-Sakai 2.4(vi) saying that $\deg \bar{E} < 3 \max_j \mu(q_j) = 6$, but in our two cases (called A-I and A-II in [7]) the proof goes by referring to Yoshihara.

Therefore $\mu(q_1) = 3$. It follows that $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a chain of type $[(2)_{t_1 + 1 - s_1}, 1]$ for some $t_1 \ge 0$ and that $\tau_1 = 2 + s_1$. If $s_1 = 1$ then C_1 is the only component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ meeting E_0. If $s_1 = 0$ then we denote the component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1$ meeting E_0 by U, otherwise we put $U = 0$. We have $U \cdot E_0 = U \cdot C_1 = 1$.

Claim. $n = 0$.

Suppose $n \ne 0$. Because $\tau^* = 1$, by 4.3(vi) no C_j is touched by ψ. If A_0 does not meet E_0 or if it meets $D_0 - E_0 - \widetilde{Q}_1$ then $D_0 - E_0 + A_0$ contains a nef chain $f = [1, 2, \ldots, 2, 1]$ containing A_0 and some C_j ($j \ge 2$ in the second case) such that $f \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = f \cdot E_0 - 4 < 0$, which contradicts the fact that $2K_0 + E_0 \ge 0$. It follows that A_0 meets E_0 and some tip of the connected component of Δ_0 contained in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. If $s_1 = 1$ then the contraction of

$D_0 - E_0 - C_1 + A_0$ maps X_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 to a cuspidal curve with cusps of multiplicity two. If $s_1 = 0$ then the same happens for the contraction of $D_0 - E_0 - U + A_0$ (note A_0 does not meet U, because U is not a component of Δ_0). But the latter cuspidal curve is Cremona equivalent to $\bar{E}$, hence Cremona non-equivalent to a line, which is impossible by the previous claim; a contradiction. By (4.4) $\zeta = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 1$.

Claim. *$p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = c = 2$ and $\gamma_0 = 5$.*

By 2.6 and 2.4(vi) $\deg \bar{E} \in \{6, 7, 8\}$. The sequence of characteristic pairs for Q_1 (see 3.5) is $\binom{3t_1+5-s_1}{3}$, $t_1 \geq 0$ and for Q_j, $2 \leq j \leq c$ it is $\binom{2t_j+1}{2}$, where $t_j \geq 1$. The Noether formula for X_0 gives $\#D_0 = \rho(X_0) = 10 - K_0^2 = 9 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, so $t_1 + t_2 + \ldots + t_c = 6 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + s_1$. We have also $\gamma = \gamma_0 + 2c + s_1$. The equations in 3.3 give:

$$3d = t_1 + 19 + \gamma_0 - 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}),$$
$$d^2 = 5t_1 + 37 + 3\gamma_0 - 4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}).$$

By 4.4(i) $4 \leq \gamma_0 \leq 4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 3$. The solutions are: $(\gamma_0, d, p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}), t_1) = (5, 7, 2, 1)$, $(5, 8, 2, 4)$, $(8, 7, 3, 0)$, $(8, 8, 3, 3)$, $(11, 8, 4, 2)$. Using 3.5 we compute

$$\operatorname{ind}(D) = 1 - \frac{3}{3t_1 + 5 - s_1} + \frac{1 + s_1}{3} + \sum_{j=2}^{c} \left(\frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{2t_j + 1}\right) \geq \frac{11}{15} + (c-1)\frac{5}{6}.$$

The Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality 4.2(iv) gives $\operatorname{ind}(D) \leq 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 3$. It follows that $c \leq 3$. Only the first two solutions satisfy the BMY inequality and only if $c = 2$. We obtain $\gamma_0 = 5$, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$, $t_1 + t_2 = 9 + s_1$ and $(d, t_1) = (7, 1)$ or $(8, 4)$.

Claim. *There is a (-1)-curve V on X_0, such that $2K_0 + E_0 \sim V$.*

Write $2K_0 + E_0 \sim V_1 + \ldots + V_k$, where V_i, $i \leq k$ are irreducible. We have $n = 0$, $\tau^* = 1$ and $K_0 \cdot (D_0 - E_0 - \mathcal{C}) = 0$, so by 4.4(ii) $\zeta = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 1 = 1$. Hence $(2K_0 + E_0)^2 = 4\zeta + E_0^2 = -1$, so there is a component V among V_i's, such that $V \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) < 0$. It follows that $V^2 < 0$ and $V \cdot K_0 < 0$, so V is a (-1)-curve for which $V \cdot E_0 \leq 1$. In particular, $V \not\subseteq D_0$.

We now show that $V \cdot (\Delta_0^+ + \Upsilon_0) = 0$, $V \cdot \Delta_0^- \leq 1$ and $V \cdot U \leq 1$. Note that $\Upsilon_0 = C_2$. Suppose V meets $\Delta_0^+ + C_2$. Let f be the shortest subchain of $\Delta_0^+ + C_2$ containing C_2 and a component of $\Delta_0^+ + C_2$ meeting V. Then $f + V$ is nef and

$$0 \leq (f + V) \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = V \cdot E_0 - 2 < 0;$$

a contradiction. Suppose $V \cdot \Delta_0^- \geq 2$. Let $f = U_1 + U_2 + \ldots + U_m$ be a subchain of Δ_0^-, such that $U_1 \cdot V$, $U_m \cdot V > 0$ and $U_1 \cdot V \geq 2$ if $m = 1$. Then $f + V$ is nef and $(f + V) \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) \leq -2 + V \cdot E_0 < 0$; a contradiction. Suppose $V \cdot U \geq 2$. Then $f = U + 2V$ is nef and $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) \leq 2V \cdot E_0 - 3$; a contradiction.

Because $\gamma_0 = 5$, we get $K_0^2 = -2$ and then (see the proof of 4.4(i))

$$(2K_0 + D_0^\flat) \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = 2\zeta + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \gamma_0 - \tau^* = 0.$$

Since $(2K_0 + D_0^\flat)$ is nef, we get $(2K_0 + D_0^\flat) \cdot V = 0$, hence $(2K_0 + D_0) \cdot V = \operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_0^- \cdot V$. But $\Delta_0^- \cdot V \leq 1$ and $\operatorname{Bk}' \Delta_0^-$ has proper fractional coefficients, so $\Delta_0^- \cdot V = 0$. It follows that $(D - E_0 - C_1 - U) \cdot V = 0$ and $(E_0 + C_1 + U) \cdot V = 2$. If V does not meet C_1 then $V \cdot E_0 = V \cdot U = 1$. If V meets C_1 then $f = V + C_1$ is nef, hence $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = -4 + \tau_1 + V \cdot E_0$, so $V \cdot E_0 = 1$ and $\tau_1 = 3$. In total, the above computations imply that the effective divisor $2K_0 + E_0 - V$ intersects trivially with all components of D_0. Because $\operatorname{Pic} X_0 \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is generated by the components of D_0, we obtain $2K_0 + E_0 - V \sim 0$. Note also that $V \cap (X_0 \setminus D_0)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^*$.

The proper transform V' of V on X is a (-1)-curve. The surface $X \setminus (D \cup V')$ contains no $\mathbb{C}^1$'s, because $X \setminus D$ contains none. Let $(X, D) \to (Y, D_Y)$ be the contraction of V'. We have $(K_Y + D_Y)^2 = (K + D)^2 + 1 = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 1$, so since (Y, D_Y) is almost minimal,

$$((K_Y + D_Y)^+)^2 = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + \mathrm{ind}(D_Y) - 1 = \mathrm{ind}(D_Y) + 1.$$

We compute

$$\mathrm{ind}(D_Y) = 1 - \frac{1}{t_1 + 1} + \frac{1 + s_1}{3} + (\frac{3}{2} - \frac{2}{2t_2 + 1}).$$

The Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality for (Y, D_Y) reads as

$$((K_Y + D_Y)^+)^2 \leq 3\chi(X \setminus (D \cup V')) = 3.$$

Thus $\mathrm{ind}(D_Y) \leq 2$. In both cases $(t_1, t_2) = (1, 8 + s_1)$ and $(4, 5 + s_1)$ this inequality fails; a contradiction. □

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

With the description of the minimalization process from Section 4 we are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1. The crucial role is played by the inequality 4.4(i) in which small $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ gives bigger restrictions on the minimal model and hence on the cuspidal curve $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$, eventually leading to a contradiction for $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 2$. We keep the assumptions and notation from the previous section. Recall that $D_n = R_n + E_n + \mathcal{C}_+ + \mathcal{C}_{exc} + \mathcal{L}$. Put $R_0 = D_0 - E_0 - \mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 5.1. *We have $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) + 1$. If the equality holds then $n = 1$, $n_{exc} = n_1 = 0$, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$ and $2K_1 + E_1 \sim 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq \zeta + 1$. By 4.3(iii)-(iv) all summands on the left hand side of 4.4(ii) are non-negative, so $\zeta = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) \leq p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ (in fact the Riemann-Roch theorem gives $\zeta \leq h^0(2K_n + E_n)$). Since $\gamma_n \geq 4$, 4.4(i) gives $\zeta \geq 1$.

Claim. *The lemma holds in case $n \neq n_{exc}$.*

By 4.3(iii) $n_{exc} \leq n$. Suppose $n \neq n_{exc}$. By 4.4(ii) $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = \zeta + 1$, $n - n_{exc} = 1$ and $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = \tau^* = K_n \cdot R_n = 0$. In particular, R_n consists of (-2)-curves. Suppose $n_{exc} \neq 0$. There exist a component L of $\mathcal{L}$, a component L' of $\mathcal{C}_{exc} + \mathcal{L} - L$ and components $U_1, \ldots, U_k$ of R_n, such that $f = L' + U_1 + \ldots + U_k + L$ is connected and has no (-2)-tips, hence is nef. Because $\tau_1^* = 0$, 4.3(vii) gives $L \cdot E_n \leq \psi_*^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0 + 1 = 1$. We have $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = -4 + f \cdot E_n$, so $f \cdot E_n \geq 4$. In particular $E_n \cdot (U_1 + \ldots + U_k) \geq 4 - E_n \cdot (L + L') \geq 1$, because $L' \cdot E_n \leq 2$ if $L' \leq \mathcal{C}_{exc}$ and $L' \cdot E_n \leq 1$ otherwise. Thus among U_i's there is a component U meeting E_n. Since $\tau^* = 0$, $U_0 = \psi_*^{-1}(U)$ is disjoint from E_0. Let i_0 be the smallest $i > 0$, such that the images of U_0 and E_0 on X_i meet. By 4.3(vii) $U \cdot E_n = 1$ and ψ_{i_0} creates no (-1)-curves in $D_i - E_i$. Because $n - n_{exc} = 1$, U is the only component of R_n meeting E_n and every other ψ_i creates a (-1)-curve. Say $U_0 \leq \widetilde{Q}_1$. We obtain $f \cdot (L + L') \geq 3$, hence $L \cdot E_n = 1$ and $L' = C_1$. Because U is contained in every chain f as above we infer that $\psi_*^{-1}(\mathcal{L}) \leq \widetilde{Q}_1$ and hence that in fact $\mathcal{L} = L$. It follows that $n = 2$ and that the cusps $q_2, \ldots, q_c$ are semi-ordinary. We have $\psi_*^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0 < L \cdot E_n$ and $U_0 \cdot E_0 < U \cdot E_n$, so 4.2(vi) implies that $U_0^2 = -3$ and $R_0 - U_0$ consists of (-2)-curves. Then $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork with a branching (-2)-curve and maximal twigs of types $[2]$, $[(2)_{t_1}, 3]$ and $[1, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1 \geq 1$ and $t_2 \geq 0$ (cf. 3.6(ii); by convention the last curve in the chain meets the branching component) and ψ_{i_0} contracts $[(2)_{t_1}]$. But then U is a tip of $D_n - E_n$, so it is not a part of $U_1 + \ldots + U_k$ as above; a contradiction.

Therefore, we have $n_{exc} = 0$ and $n = 1$. Suppose that A_0 meets E_0. Then ψ contracts exactly A_0 together with some (-2)-twig of D_0, so R_0 consists of (-2)-curves and one (-3)-curve V. This again implies that $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork with a branching (-2)-curve and maximal twigs of types $[2]$, $[(2)_{t_1}, 3]$, $[1, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$. Furthermore, A_0 touches the tip of D_0 contained in $[(2)_{t_1}]$. The contraction of $A_0 + D_0 - E_0 - V$ maps X_0 to onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 onto a cuspidal curve with only semi-ordinary cusps. By 4.6 this is a contradiction. Thus $A_0 \cdot E_0 = 0$. It follows that components of R_1 intersect $2K_1 + E_1$ trivially. Because $\tau^* = \#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$, in fact all components of $D_1 - E_1$ intersect $2K_1 + E_1$ trivially. But $X \setminus D$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-acyclic, so the components of D generate $\mathrm{NS}(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$, hence the components of D_1 generate $\mathrm{NS}(X_1) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. We have $2K_1 + E_1 \geq 0$, so $2K_1 + E_1 \sim 0$ if and only if $E_1 \cdot (2K_1 + E_1) = 0$. Now in case $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$ we have $\zeta = 1$, so 4.4(i) gives $\gamma_1 = 4$ and hence $E_1 \cdot (2K_1 + E_1) = E_1 \cdot K_1 - 2 = 0$, so we are done.

We may therefore assume that $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq 3$. By 4.2(iv) $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') \leq 1$. Since $\tau^* = 0$, ψ_0 contracts exactly c (-2)-tips of D_1, so $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') \geq \frac{1}{2}c$, hence $c \leq 2$. If $c = 2$ then the contribution from other twigs to $\mathrm{ind}(D_1')$ is zero, so both $\widetilde{Q}_j$, $j = 1, 2$ are chains and hence are of type $[(2)_{t_j}, 1]$ for some $t_j \geq 0$. But in the latter case $\widetilde{Q}_j - C_j$ is a part of Δ_0^+, hence is not touched by ψ; a contradiction. Thus $c = 1$. Then the contribution to $\mathrm{ind}(D_1')$ from E_1 and the (-2)-tip contracted by ψ_0 is $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\gamma} > \frac{1}{2}$. Because $R_1 = D_1 - E_1 - C_1'$ consists of (-2)-curves, the contribution from each other twig is at least $\frac{1}{2}$, so in fact D_1' has no other twigs. In particular, $\widetilde{Q}_1$ has at most one branching component. If $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a chain then, because $\tau_1^* = 0$, $\widetilde{Q}_1 = [(2)_{t_1}, 1]$ for some $t_1 \geq 0$ and we have a contradiction as before. Thus $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork and A_0 meets its two tips different than C_1. Let B be the branching component. Because C_1 is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$, the twig T containing C_1 consists of C_1 and some number of (-2)-curves. After the contraction of T, B becomes a (-1)-curve, so we have $B^2 = -2$ and because $n_{exc} = 0$, B is not touched by ψ. Let U be a component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T$ meeting B. It is not contracted by ψ, so $\psi(U)$ is a (-2)-curve and $\psi(\widetilde{Q}_1 - U - C_1 + A_0)$ is a (-2)-chain disjoint from E_1. Thus the contraction of $\widetilde{Q}_1 + A_0 - U$ maps X_1 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_1 onto a unicuspidal curve with a semi-ordinary cusp. This is a contradiction by 4.6. Thus we may, and shall, assume further that $n = n_{exc}$.

Claim. $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$.

Suppose C_1 is touched by ψ. By 4.4(ii) we have: $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = \zeta + 1$, $\mathcal{C}_+ = C_1'$, $K_n \cdot C_1' + \tau_1^* = 0$, $\tau_j^* = 0$ for $j > 1$ and R_n consists of (-2)-curves. By 4.3(vii) if $E_n \cdot C_1' > E_0 \cdot C_1$ then some ψ_i contracts A_{i-1} and a (-2)-twig meeting C_1, and hence touches the image of C_1 once. But such ψ_i would create no (-1)-curve in $D_i - E_i$. Therefore

$$E_n \cdot C_1' = E_0 \cdot C_1 = \tau_1 = \tau_1^* + 1 + s_1.$$

Blow up $m \geq 0$ times on the intersection of the proper transforms of E_n and C_1', denote the resulting morphism by $p\colon \widetilde{X} \to X_n$ and the proper transforms of C_1' and E_n by $\widetilde{C}_1$ and $\widetilde{E}$ respectively. Then $(\widetilde{C}_1)^2 = (C_1')^2 - m$ and

$$\widetilde{C}_1 \cdot \widetilde{E} = \tau_1 - m = 3 + s_1 + (C_1')^2 - m.$$

Take $m = (C_1')^2$. Then $\widetilde{C}_1$ is a 0-curve, so 2.4(iv) gives $s_1 = 1$. Let U be the component of D_0 which is made into a (-1)-curve by the (unique) ψ_{i_0} touching C_1. Since $s_j = 1$ for each j, $U \cdot E_0 = 0$. If U meets C_1 then $\psi(U)$ is a (-1)-curve meeting C_j' twice, so the divisor $\psi(U) + C_1'$ is nef. But in the latter case

$$0 \leq (\psi(U) + C_1') \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = \psi(U) \cdot E_n - \tau^* \leq 1 - \tau_1^*,$$

which is impossible. Therefore $U \cdot C_1 = 0$. Take $m = (C_1')^2 + 1$. Then $\widetilde{C}_1$ is a (-1)-curve and it meets transversally $\widetilde{U}$, the proper transform of U, for which $\widetilde{U}^2 = \psi(U)^2 = -1$. Because $\widetilde{U} + \widetilde{C}_1$ is nef, by 2.4(iv) we get $\widetilde{E} \cdot (\widetilde{U} + \widetilde{C}_1) \geq 4$, so $E_n \cdot \psi(U) = \widetilde{E} \cdot \widetilde{U} \geq 1$. Because each ψ_i, $i \geq 1$ creates a (-1)-curve in $D_i - E_i$, 4.3(vii) shows that no ψ_i with $i \leq i_0$ increases the intersection of images of E_0 and U, hence the image of U on X_{i_0} is a (-1)-curve disjoint from E_{i_0}. By 4.3(v) no ψ_i with $i > i_0$ touches U, so $\psi(U) \cdot E_n = 0$; a contradiction.

We obtain $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$ and

$$\tau^* + K_n \cdot R_n = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \zeta \leq 1. \tag{5.1}$$

Then $D_n - E_n$ consists of at most one (-3)-curve, some number of (-2)-curves and $c+n$ (-1)-curves. Moreover, by 4.3(vii) the intersection with the image of E_0 may increase under ψ only for components of D_0 which become components of $\mathcal{L}$.

Claim. *If L is a component of $\mathcal{L}$ with $L \cdot E_n \leq 1$ and M a component of $D_n - E_n - L$ meeting L then $L \cdot M = 1$. Furthermore, if $M^2 = -1$ then $\tau_1^* = s_1 = L \cdot E_n = 1$ and the ψ_{i_0} creating L contracts only A_{i_0-1}.*

First of all note that each ψ_i can increase the intersection of two components of the boundary divisor by at most one. Because $n = n_{exc}$, 4.3(v) implies that for any two components $V \neq W$ of D_0 we have $\psi(V) \cdot \psi(W) \leq V \cdot W + 1$. Say L is created by some ψ_{i_0} for $i_0 > 0$. Denote the proper transforms of M and L on X_0 by M' and L' respectively. Put $m = -M^2$.

Assume M is not a (-1)-curve and suppose $M \cdot L > 1$. Then $M' \neq C_j$ and M' meets L'. It follows that $M' \cdot L' = 1$ and $M \cdot L = 2$. By (5.1) $\tau^* + m \leq 3$. If $L \cdot E_n = 0$ then 4.3(i) gives $M \cdot E_n + 2m \geq 8$, so $M \cdot E_n = 2$ and $m = 3$, hence $\tau^* = 0$. But in the latter case $M' \cdot E_0 > 0$, so $\tau^* > 0$; a contradiction. Thus $L \cdot E_n \geq 1$. The ψ_{i_0} creating L is the only ψ_i touching the proper transform of L. Indeed, this is a consequence of 4.3(iii),(v) and the equality $n = n_{exc}$. Since ψ_{i_0} does not touch E_{i_0-1}, we have $L' \cdot E_0 = L \cdot E_n = 1$, so $\tau^* = 1$ and, since M' and L' are contained in the same $\widetilde{Q}_j$, $M' \cdot E_0 = 0$. Then $M \cdot E_n \leq 1$ and $m = 2$, which contradicts 4.3(i).

Assume $M^2 = -1$. By 4.3(iii) M is not a component of $\mathcal{L}$, so $M' = C_j$ for some j, say for $j = 1$. Then $M + L = C_1' + L$ is nef, so

$$0 \leq (C_1' + L) \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = \tau_1^* + s_1 + L \cdot E_n - 3,$$

so, since by assumption $L \cdot E_n \leq 1$, we have $\tau_1^* = s_1 = L \cdot E_n = 1$. By (5.1) R_n consists of (-2)-curves and $\tau_j^* = 0$ for $j \geq 2$. Because $s_1 = 1$, L' is disjoint from E_0 and A_{i_0-1} meets E_{i_0-1}. Since C_1 is not touched by ψ, L' is the unique component of $D_0 - E_0$ meeting C_1, hence a (-2)-curve. If A_{i_0-1} meets L' then ψ_{i_0} contracts only A_{i_0-1} and we are done. Thus we may assume A_{i_0-1} does not meet L'. Then there is a (-2)-twig Δ_L in $D_0 - E_0$ meeting L' contracted by ψ. Since C_1 is not touched by ψ, L' is a branching (-2)-curve in $D_0 - E_0$. Since $K_n \cdot R_n = 0$ and $n = n_{exc}$, 4.3(vii) implies that images of non-contracted components of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1 - L'$ are either (-1)-curves meeting E_n at most once or (-2)-curves disjoint from E_n. The divisor $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a rational snc-tree contractible to a point, so L' meets a component U with self-intersection smaller than (-2) (cf. 3.6). Because L' has self-intersection (-2), ψ touches it once, so $\psi_*(U) \neq 0$. By 4.4(iii) $\psi(U)^2 \neq -1$, so $\psi(U)^2 = -2$. But $U^2 < -2$, so ψ touches U. Since $n = n_{exc}$, there is a component V of $\mathcal{L} - L$ meeting $\psi(U)$. By 4.3(vii) for the nef divisor $f = L + \psi(U) + V$ we obtain $f \cdot E_n = 1 + V \cdot E_n \leq 2 + \psi_*^{-1}(V) \cdot E_0 \leq 3$. Then $f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) < 0$; a contradiction.

Claim. $\zeta = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 1$.

Suppose $\zeta = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. By (5.1) R_n consists of (-2)-curves and $\tau^* = 0$. Then C_j's are the only components of D_0 meeting E_0 and they are not touched by ψ. Suppose L is a (-1)-curve in D_n created by ψ. By definition, it is not a superfluous component of D_n. By 4.3(vii) $L \cdot E_n \leq 1$, so the previous claim implies that we can find two (-2)-curves, say V_1, V_2 in D_n meeting L. Moreover, by 4.3(vii) V_1, V_2 are disjoint from E_n, so for $f = V_1 + 2L + V_2$ we have $f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = 2L \cdot E_n - 4 < 0$. But $2K_n + E_n \geq 0$ and f is nef; a contradiction. Thus $n_{exc} = n = 0$ and R_0 consists of (-2)-curves. It follows that $D_0 - E_0$ contains no branching components, so all cusps of $\bar{E}$ are semi-ordinary. Such curves have been ruled out in 4.6; a contradiction.

Claim. $K_0 \cdot R_0 = K_n \cdot R_n = 1$.

We first show that $K_0 \cdot R_0 = K_n \cdot R_n$. Because every ψ_{i+1}, $i \geq 0$ creates a (-1)-curve in $D_i - E_i$, we may assume that there exists $i \geq 0$, such that $A_i \cdot E_i = 0$, otherwise we are done. Let $L \leq \mathcal{L}$ be the image of the (-1)-curve created by ψ_{i+1}. Then $L \cdot E_n = L' \cdot E_0 \leq 1$, where $L' = \psi_*^{-1}(L)$. By the third claim we may also assume L does not meet (-1)-curves in $D_n - E_n - L$. Then, as before, we can find in $D_n - E_n$ some (-2)-curves V_1 and V_2 meeting L. We have $n = n_{exc}$, so since V_i are not (-1)-curves, by 4.3(vii) $(V_1 + V_2) \cdot E_n = \psi_*^{-1}(V_1 + V_2) \cdot E_0$. Because $s_j = 1$ for $j \neq 1$, we have $\psi_*^{-1}(V_1 + V_2) \cdot E_0 \leq 1$, so for the nef divisor $f = V_1 + 2L + V_2$ we get $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) \leq \psi_*^{-1}(V_1 + V_2) \cdot E_0 - 2 < 0$; a contradiction. Thus $K_0 \cdot R_0 = K_n \cdot R_n \leq 1$. If $K_0 \cdot R_0 = 0$ then $D_0 - E_0$ has no branching components and hence the cusps $q_2, \ldots, q_c$ are semi-ordinary and q_1 has multiplicity three, which is impossible by 4.6.

Now the equation (5.1) gives $\tau^* = 0$. Because we know that each $\widetilde{Q}_j$ contracts to a smooth point and that C_j is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_j$, it follows that the cusps $q_2, q_3, \ldots, q_c$ are semi-ordinary and $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork with a (-2)-curve as a branching component and maximal twigs of types $[2], [(2)_{t_1}, 3]$ and $[1, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$. Let U be the (-3)-curve in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. The argument with finding nef chains of type $[1, 2, \ldots, 2, 1]$ in $D_n - E_n$ shows that no A_i meets $\widetilde{Q}_2 + \ldots + \widetilde{Q}_c$ or the twigs $[(2)_{t_2}]$ or $[2]$. If $n \neq 0$ then, because $K_n \cdot R_n = 1$, ψ does not touch U, so A_0 meets the component of $[(2)_{t_1}]$ meeting U and $t_1 \geq 2$. But in the latter case the contraction of $D_0 - E_0 - U + A_0$ maps X_0 to $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 to a cuspidal curve with semi-ordinary cusps, which contradicts 4.6.

Thus $n = 0$. We obtain $\#D_0 = \rho(X_0) = 10 - K_0^2 = 10 + K_0 \cdot E_0 - \zeta$, so $\#D_0 = 9 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ and hence $x + t_1 + t_2 = 4 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, where $x = \#(\widetilde{Q}_2 + \ldots + \widetilde{Q}_c)$. In particular, $t_1 \leq 4 + \gamma_0 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. The sequence of characteristic pairs for $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is $\binom{2t_1+3}{2}, \binom{1}{1}_{t_2+1}$, so the equations in 3.3(i),(ii) read as

$$\begin{aligned} 3d &= 2t_1 - 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + \gamma_0 + 20 \\ d^2 &= 12t_1 + 44 - 4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + 3\gamma_0. \end{aligned}$$

Now 4.4(i) gives $4 \leq \gamma_0 \leq 4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2$ and one checks that with this bound solutions exist only for $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 4$. By 4.2(iv) $\mathrm{ind}(D) \leq 1$. But Q_1 has three maximal twigs and at least two of them are (-2)-twigs, so the contribution to $\mathrm{ind}(D)$ from Q_1 is bigger than 1; a contradiction. □

Lemma 5.2. [10, Theorem 3.3]. *Let E be a smooth rational curve on a smooth rational surface Y. If $E^2 = -4$ and C is a (-1)-curve for which $E \cdot C = 2$ then $|E + 2C|$ induces an elliptic fibration of Y. In particular, if $2K_Y + E \sim 0$ then any (-1)-curve on Y gives*

such a fibration. Moreover, in the latter case the fibration has no section and singular fibers other than $E+2C$ consist of (-2)-curves.

Proof. The divisor $f = E + 2C$ has arithmetic genus 1 and self-intersection zero. We have $E+2C = (E+C+K_Y)+(C-K_Y)$ and $h^0(E+C+K_Y) \geq 1$, $h^0(C-K_Y) \geq 1$ by Riemann-Roch. Since C is not in the fixed part of $E+C+K_Y$ or $C-K_Y$, there is more than one effective divisor in $|E+2C|$, so $h^0(E+2C) \geq 2$. The exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_Y(2C) \to \mathcal{O}_Y(E+2C) \to \mathcal{O}_E \to 0$$

gives in fact $h^0(E+2C) = 2$. This gives an elliptic fibration $\theta\colon Y \to \mathbb{P}^1$ with $E+2C$ as a fiber. If the equivalence $2K_Y+E \sim 0$ holds then θ has no 1-section because $f \sim 2(C-K_Y)$ and a component of a singular fiber other than $E+2C$ intersects $2K_Y \sim -E$ trivially, hence it is a (-2)-curve. □

Lemma 5.3. *If $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$ then $\zeta = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\zeta = K_n \cdot (K_n+E_n) \neq 1$. By 5.1 $\zeta \leq 0$, so 4.4(i) gives $4 \leq \gamma_n+\tau^*+(n-\eta) \leq 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{D}) + 2\zeta \leq 4$. Thus $\zeta = 0$, $\gamma_n = 4$, $\tau^* = 0$ and $n = \eta$. In particular, $n = n_{exc}$ and by 4.3(vi) $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$. Then 4.4(ii) gives $K_n \cdot R_n = 2$. Note that by 4.3(vii) for every component V of R_n we have $V \cdot E_n = \psi_*^{-1}(V) \cdot E_0 = 0$. Even with all this information the proof is long.

Claim. *Every component of $\mathcal{L}$ meets E_n once.*

Suppose $L \cdot E_n \neq 1$ for some component L of $\mathcal{L}$. Put $L' = \psi_*^{-1}(L)$. By 4.2(vi) $L \cdot E_n \leq L' \cdot E_0 + 1 = 1$, so $L \cdot E_n = 0$. Suppose first that every component of $D_n - E_n$ meets L at most once. Since L is not superfluous, at least three components of $D_n - E_n$, say V_1, V_2, V_3, meet L. By 4.3(iii) they are components of $R_n + \mathcal{C}_{exc} + \mathcal{C}_+$. However, if some C_j', say C_1', meets L then $f = L + C_1'$ is nef and $f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = C_1' \cdot E_n - 4 = C_1 \cdot E_0 - 4 = \tau_1 - 4 < 0$, which is impossible, because $2K_n + E_n \geq 0$. We infer that V_i are components of R_n, so they do not meet E_n. Only one of them may be a (-2)-curve. Indeed, if V_1 and V_2 are (-2)-curves then $f = V_1 + 2L + V_2$ is nef and $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = -4$; a contradiction. Since $K_n \cdot R_n = 2$, 4.3(v) implies that $V_1^2 = V_2^2 = -3$ and $V_3^2 = -2$. The divisor $f = 3L + V_1 + V_2 + V_3$ is nef. Because $2L$ is in the fixed part of $2K_n + E_n$, we have $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n - 2L) = 2(V_1 + V_2 + V_3) \cdot (K_n - L) = -2$; a contradiction.

Therefore, there is a component $V' \leq D_0$, say $V' \leq \widetilde{Q}_1$, such that for $V = \psi(V')$ we have $V \cdot L \geq 2$. Again, V is a component of R_n and hence is disjoint from E_n. As in the proof of the third claim of 5.1 we note that $V \cdot L \leq V' \cdot L' + 1$, so $L' \cdot V' = 1$ and $L \cdot V = 2$. By 4.3(i) $V^2 = -4$, and hence $R_n - V$ consists of (-2)-curves.

Suppose some other (-1)-curve $U \leq D_n - E_n$ meets V. Then $f = V + 2L + U$ is nef, hence $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_n + E_n) = U \cdot E_n - 2$, so $U = C_1$. Because C_1 is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ not touched by ψ, $C_1 \cdot V' \neq 0$, and then V' is a (-2)-curve. However, $(V')^2 \leq V^2 \leq -4$; a contradiction. Thus L is the unique (-1)-curve in D_n meeting V. Therefore, there is a component M of R_n meeting $L+V$. In fact $M \cdot L = 0$, otherwise $f = V + 3L + M$ is a nef divisor intersecting $2K_n + E_n$ negatively. Because $n = n_{exc}$, the fact that L is the unique (-1)-curve in $D_n - E_n$ meeting V implies that $V \cdot M = V' \cdot \psi_*^{-1}(M) \leq 1$, so $V \cdot M = 1$. Put $f_1 = V + 2L$ and $f_2 = E_n + 2C_1'$. We have $f_1 \cdot f_2 = 2C_1' \cdot V + 4C_1' \cdot L = 0$. By 5.2 f_1 and f_2 are fibers of the same elliptic fibration of X_n, so $f_1 \sim f_2$. But $f_1 \cdot M = 1$ and $f_2 \cdot M = 2C_1' \cdot M$, which is even; a contradiction.

Claim. *$K_0 \cdot R_0 = 2$ and each ψ_i with $i \geq 1$ contracts exactly A_{i-1}.*

We may assume $n \neq 0$. Let L be any component of $\mathcal{L}$. Let ψ_{i_0} be the first ψ_i with $i \geq 1$ touching some proper transform of L. In fact it is ψ_{i_0} which creates L. Indeed, because $n = n_{exc}$, ψ_{i_0} creates a (-1)-curve, whose image on X_n would otherwise be a (-1)-curve (cf. 4.3(v)) meeting L, contradicting 4.3(iii). It follows that only ψ_{i_0} touches some proper transform of L. Put $L' = \psi_*^{-1}(L)$. We have $L' \cdot E_0 = 0$ and $L \cdot E_n = 1$, so by 4.3(vii) $A_{i_0-1} \cdot E_{i_0-1} = 1$. Then ψ_{i_0} is of type I, so ψ_{i_0}, and hence ψ, touches L' once, so L' is a (-2)-curve. It follows that $K_0 \cdot R_0 = K_n \cdot R_n = 2$.

Suppose some ψ_i with $i \geq 1$ contracts more then just A_{i-1}. Then ψ_i contracts a maximal (-2)-twig of $D_{i-1} - E_{i-1}$ and hence touches a component of $D_{i-1} - E_{i-1}$, say B, meeting it. Because $K_0 \cdot R_0 = K_n \cdot R_n$, B is a branching (-2)-curve in $D_{i-1} - E_{i-1}$. Now the equality $n = \eta$ implies that B meets another (-2)-twig of $D_{i-1} - E_{i-1}$, which contradicts 4.2(v).

We have $K_n^2 = \zeta - K_n \cdot E_n = -2$, so the Noether formula gives $\rho(X_n) = 10 - K_n^2 = 12$ and hence $\#D_n = 12 + n$ by 4.2(iii). Since every A_i meets E_i, $\gamma_0 = \gamma_n + n$. The claim above gives

$$\#D_0 = \#D_n = 12 + n.$$

We have $K_0 \cdot R_0 = 2$. Let U_1 be a component of R_0 with $U_1^2 \leq -3$. If $U_1^2 = -4$ then such U_1 is unique (then we put $U_2 = 0$). If $U_1^2 = -3$ then there is another such curve, call it U_2, and $U_2^2 = -3$. The divisor $R_0 - U_1 - U_2$ consists of (-2)-curves. The morphism ψ does not touch $U_1 + U_2$. Note that if $n \geq 2$ then, since $\eta = n$, D_n has at least two and hence D_n' has at least three (-2)-twigs, so $\mathrm{ind}(D_n') \geq \frac{3}{2}$. But 4.2(iv) gives $n + \mathrm{ind}(D_n') \leq 3$, so $n \leq 1$. Observe also that if $f = [1, 2, \ldots, 2]$ is any chain in $D_0 - E_0$ containing come C_j then ψ does not touch it. Indeed, otherwise, because $n = n_{exc}$, $D_n - E_n$ contains a nef chain of type $[1, 2, \ldots, 2, 1]$ and such a chain meets E_n at most three times, which contradicts 2.4(iii). In particular, the cusps q_j for which $\widetilde{Q}_j$ contains neither U_1 nor U_2 are semi-ordinary, so in 3.3 applied to (X_0, D_0) we obtain $M(q_j) = I(q_j) = \#\widetilde{Q}_j$. Let x be the total number of components of all such $\widetilde{Q}_j$'s. The equations in 3.3(i),(ii) read as

$$3d' + 1 = \sum_j M(q_j) \tag{5.2}$$

$$(d')^2 + 1 = \sum_j I(q_j), \tag{5.3}$$

where $d' = d/2$.

Claim. *$U_2 \neq 0$. U_1 and U_2 belong to different connected components of $D_0 - E_0$.*

We may assume U_1 is a component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Suppose $U_2 = 0$. Then $U_1^2 = -4$ and $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork with maximal twigs $[2, 2]$, $[(2)_{t_1}, 4]$ and $[1, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$ (cf. 3.6(iii)). The characteristic pairs of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ are $\binom{3t_1+4}{3}$, $\binom{1}{1}_{t_2+1}$. We have $12 + n = \#D_0 = t_1 + t_2 + x + 6$, so $3d' = 2t_1 + n + 12$ and $(d')^2 = 8t_1 + n + 18$, hence $(d')^2 - 12d' + 30 + 3n = 0$. The latter equation is equivalent to $(d' - 6)^2 = 3(2 - n)$, which has no solutions for $n \leq 1$; a contradiction.

Thus $U_2 \neq 0$, so $U_1^2 = U_2^2 = -3$. Let T be the maximal twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing the (-1)-tip C_1. Since $\widetilde{Q}_1$ can be contracted to a smooth point by successive contractions of (-1)-curves, we see that $T - C_1$ consists of (-2)-curves and meets $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T$ in a branching (-2)-curve. Suppose $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T$ is a chain. Then $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T = [3, 1, 2, 3, (2)_{t_1}]$ for some $t_1 \geq 0$. The sequence of characteristic pairs for $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is $\binom{3t_1+5}{3}, \binom{1}{1}_{t_2+1}$ for some $t_2 \geq 0$ and $12 + n =$

$\#D_0 = t_1 + t_2 + x + 6$, so (5.2) and (5.3) combine to give $(d')^2 - 3d' = 6t_1 + 8$. The latter equation gives $3|(d')^2 + 1$; a contradiction.

It follows that $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T$ is a fork with a branching component B which is a (-2)- or a (-3)-curve. In the first case the maximal twigs of this fork are $[2]$, $[(2)_{t_1}, 3]$, $[2, 2, 3, (2)_{t_2-1}]$ for some $t_1 \geq 0$, $t_2 \geq 1$ and in the second case $[2]$, $[(2)_{t_1}, 3]$, $[2, 2]$. The sequence of characteristic pairs for $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is

$$\binom{4t_1+6}{4}, \binom{2}{2}_{t_2}, \binom{2}{1}, \binom{1}{1}_{t_3+1}$$

for some $t_1, t_2, t_3 \geq 0$. Also, $\#D_0 = t_1 + t_2 + t_3 + x + 7$, so $t_1 + t_2 + t_3 + x = n + 5$. The equations (5.2) and (5.3) read as

$$\begin{aligned} 3d' &= 3t_1 + t_2 + 16 + n \\ (d')^2 &= 15 + 3t_2 + 34 + n. \end{aligned}$$

But $t_1 + t_2 \leq n + 5 \leq 6$ and with this bound they have no solutions; a contradiction. Thus, U_2 belongs to, say, $\widetilde{Q}_2$.

Claim. *$n = 0$ and $\deg \bar{E} \in \{8, 10\}$.*

For $j = 1, 2$ the curve C_j is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ and $\widetilde{Q}_j - C_j - U_j$ consists of (-2)-curves. Then $\widetilde{Q}_j$ is a fork with a branching (-2)-curve and maximal twigs of type $[2], [(2)_{t_j}, 3], [1, (2)_{t'_j}]$ for some $t_j, t'_j \geq 0$. We obtain $\#\widetilde{Q}_1 + \#\widetilde{Q}_2 + 1 + x = \#D_0 = 12 + n$, so $t_1 + t'_1 + t_2 + t'_2 + x = n + 3 \leq 4$. The sequence of characteristic pairs of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ for $j = 1, 2$ is $\binom{2t_j+3}{2}, \binom{1}{1}_{t'_j+1}$, so $3d' = t_1 + t_2 + n + 12$ and $(d')^2 = 3(t_1 + t_2) + n + 16$, where $d' = \deg \bar{E}/2$. In particular,the second equation taken modulo 3 gives $n = 0$, so $t_1 + t_2 + t'_1 + t'_2 + x = 3$. The solutions are $(\deg \bar{E}, t_1 + t_2) = (8, 0)$ and $(10, 3)$. This is one of the most 'resistant' cases in the article.

Claim. *There is a (-1)-curve V for which $V \cdot (D_0 - U_1 - U_2) = 0$ and $V \cdot U_1 = V \cdot U_2 = 1$.*

We have $2K_0 + E_0 \geq 0$ and $(2K_0 + E_0)^2 = 4(\zeta - 1) < 0$, so there is an irreducible curve V such that $2K_0 + E_0 - V \geq 0$ and $(2K_0 + E_0) \cdot V < 0$. Clearly, $V \neq E_0$, so we get $V^2 < 0$ and $K \cdot V < 0$, hence V is a (-1)-curve meeting E_0 at most once. But $E_0 \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) = \gamma_0 - 4 = 0$, so since E_0 is not in the fixed part of $2K_0 + E_0 - V$, we have in fact $V \cdot E_0 = 0$. Since the inequality 4.4(i), which is an equality in our case, is equivalent to $(2K_0 + D_0^\flat) \cdot (2K_0 + E_0) \geq 0$ ($n = 0$, so the divisor $2K_0 + D_0^\flat$ is nef), we get $(2K_0 + D_0^\flat) \cdot V = 0$. Therefore

$$V \cdot (D_0 - E_0 - \Upsilon_0 - \Delta_0^+ - \mathrm{Bk}'\, \Delta_0^-) = 2.$$

The argument with finding nef divisors in $D_0 - E_0$ of type $[1, 2, \ldots, 2, 1]$ shows that V is disjoint from $D - \Delta_0^- - U_1 - U_2$ and meets Δ_0^- at most once. We get the equality $V \cdot (D_0 - E_0 - \mathrm{Bk}'\, \Delta_0^-) = 2$. In particular, $V \cdot \mathrm{Bk}'\, \Delta_0^-$ is an integer, so V is disjoint from Δ_0^-, hence $V \cdot D = V \cdot (U_1 + U_2) = 2$. If V meets only one U_i then $U_i + 2V$ is nef and intersects $2K_0 + E_0$ negatively, which is impossible. We obtain $V \cdot U_1 = V \cdot U_2 = 1$.

Let $p\colon (X_0, D_0) \to (Y, D_Y)$ be the contraction of V. The dual graph of $p_*(\widetilde{Q}_1 + \widetilde{Q}_2)$ is



where $t_1 + t_2 + t'_1 + t'_2 + x = 3$ and $t_1 + t_2 \in \{0, 3\}$.

Claim. *$x = t_1 = t_2 = 0$ and $t'_1 + t'_2 = 3$.*

Because ψ_0 does not touch V, the proper transform V' of V on X is a (-1)-curve. Let $p' \colon (X, D) \to (Y', D_{Y'})$ be the contraction of V'. Note D'_Y is an snc-divisor. The surface $Y' \setminus D_{Y'}$ contains no $\mathbb{C}^1$'s, because $X \setminus D$ contains none. Then 2.1 gives $((K_{Y'} + D_{Y'})^-)^2 = -\operatorname{ind}(D_{Y'})$. We have $(p')^*(K_{Y'} + D_{Y'}) = K + D + V$, so by 4.2(ii) $(K_{Y'} + D_{Y'})^2 = (K + D)^2 + (K + D) \cdot V = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2 + 1 = 1$, giving $((K_{Y'} + D_{Y'})^+)^2 = \operatorname{ind}(D_{Y'}) + 1$. We compute $\chi(Y' \setminus D_{Y'}) = \chi(X \setminus D) - \chi(V \cap (X \setminus D)) = 1$. Then the logarithmic Bogomolov-Miyaoka-Yau inequality for $(Y', D_{Y'})$ reads as $\operatorname{ind}(D_{Y'}) \leq 2$. But $D_{Y'}$ is obtained from D_Y by resolving the tangency of C_j's and E_0, which replaces the chains $[(2)_{t'_j}]$ with $[2, 1, 3, (2)_{t'_j}]$. The contribution to $\operatorname{ind}(D_{Y'})$ from the twigs of $D_{Y'}$ over q_j, $j = 1, 2$ is therefore $2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + \frac{t_j}{t_j+1}$, so the inequality $\operatorname{ind}(D_{Y'}) \leq 2$ shows that $t_1 = t_2 = 0$ and there is no contribution from $\widetilde{Q}_3 + \ldots + \widetilde{Q}_c$. The latter means that $x = 0$, which gives $t'_1 + t'_2 = 3$.

By symmetry we may assume $t'_1 \in \{2, 3\}$. Let G_1 be the component of $p_*\widetilde{Q}_1$ meeting p_*C_1 and let μF, where μ is the multiplicity, be the fiber of the elliptic fibration of Y induced by $|p_*(E_0 + 2C_1)|$ (see 5.2) which contains $p_*(\widetilde{Q}_1 + \widetilde{Q}_2 - C_1 - C_2) - G_1$. Since $K_Y^2 = K_0^2 + 1 = -1$, all fibers other than $p_*(E_0 + 2C_1)$ are minimal, i.e. they consist of (-2)-curves. Suppose $t'_1 = 2$. Then the latter divisor has two branching components, hence equals F_{red}, and F is of Kodaira type I_3^* (called also $\widetilde{D}_7$; for the classification of fibers and basic facts on elliptic fibrations see for example [1, V.7]). Because F_{red} is simply connected, $\mu = 1$. Since G_1 meets one of the tips of F_{red}, whose multiplicities in F are 1, we get $G \cdot (\mu F) = G \cdot F_{red} = 1$. This is a contradiction, because G_1 is a 2-section of the fibration. Therefore $t'_1 = 3$. In this case $p_*(\widetilde{Q}_1 + \widetilde{Q}_2 - C_1 - C_2) - G_1$ is a (-2)-fork with maximal twigs of lengths $1, 2, 4$, which implies that F is of Kodaira type II^* ($\widetilde{E}_8$). But then the component of F meeting C_2 has multiplicity three in F. This is in contradiction with the fact that C_2 is a 2-section. □

We now prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By 5.1 and 4.4(i) $4p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2 \geq 2\zeta + 2p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq \gamma_n \geq 4$, so $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq 2$. By 4.2(iv) $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 4$. Because $(K + D)^2 = K \cdot (K + D) - 2 = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2$, we only need to show that $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \neq 2$. Suppose $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$.

Claim. *$n = \zeta = 1$, $n_{exc} = n_1 = 0$ and $2K_1 + E_1 \sim 0$.*

Lemma 5.3 gives $\zeta = 1$, so by 5.1 $n = 1$, $n_{exc} = n_1 = 0$ and $2K_1 + E_1 \sim 0$.

Note that in particular $\eta = 0$. We have also $K_1 \cdot E_1 = 2\zeta = 2$, so $\gamma_1 = 4$ and $K_1^2 = -1$. By 4.4(ii) $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = \tau^* = K_1 \cdot R_1 = 0$. By 4.2(iii) $\#D_1 = \rho(X_2) + 1 = 11 - K_1^2 = 12$. We may assume A_0 meets $\widetilde{Q}_1$ and does not meet $\widetilde{Q}_3 + \ldots + \widetilde{Q}_c$. Then the cusps $q_3, \ldots, q_c$ are semi-ordinary.

Claim. *A_0 does not meet $\widetilde{Q}_j$ for $j \geq 2$.*

Suppose A_0 meets $\widetilde{Q}_2$. Let $j = 1, 2$. Because $\psi = \psi_1$ does not create (-1)-curves in $D_1 - E_1$, $\widetilde{Q}_j$ contains a component with self-intersection smaller than (-2) and ψ contracts some component of Δ_0^-. In particular, $\widetilde{Q}_j$ contains a branching component. Let T_j be the twig of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ (not necessarily maximal, possibly empty) contracted by ψ and let $V_j \leq \widetilde{Q}_j - T_j - C_j$ be the component of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ meeting $T_j + A_0$. We see that $V_j^2 \leq -3$ and that $\widetilde{Q}_j - C_j - V_j - T_j$ consists of (-2)-curves and is not touched by ψ. Contract successively

(-1)-curves in $\widetilde{Q}_j$ until V_j becomes a (-1)-curve; denote the images of $\widetilde{Q}_j$ and V_j by Q'_j and V'_j respectively. Put $W_j = Q'_j - V'_j - T_j$. Clearly, W_j consists of (-2)-curves and meets the (-1)-curve V'_j. It follows that W_j is a chain; write $W_j = [(2)_{w_j}]$ for some $w_j \geq 0$. Now 3.7 implies that $Q'_j = [(2)_{w_j}, 1]$ or $Q'_j = [(2)_{w_j}, 1, w_j + 2, (2)_{t_j}]$ for some $t_j \geq 0$, so $T_j = 0$ or $T_j = [(2)_{t_j}, w_j + 2]$. In particular, we see that $R_0 = D_0 - E_0 - \mathcal{C}$ contains at most four components which are not (-2)-curves. Put $v_j = -V_j^2$. We have $v_j \geq 3$. The divisor $\widetilde{Q}_j - T_j$ is a fork with a branching (-2)-curve and maximal twigs $W_j + V_j$, $[(2)_{v_j-2}]$ and $[1, (2)_{a_j}]$ for some $a_j \geq 0$. We compute that the contribution to $\mathrm{ind}(D'_1)$ from the maximal twigs of D'_1 over q_j is $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{w_j}{w_j+1} + \frac{v_j-2}{v_j-1} \geq 1$. By 4.2(iv) $\mathrm{ind}(D'_1) \leq 2$. This gives $v_1 = v_2 = 3$ and $w_1 = w_2 = 0$. By (4.2) A_0 meets exactly one (-2)-twig of D_0, so we have $T_1 \neq 0$ and $T_2 = 0$. By the definition of V_j's ψ maps the chain $V_1 + T_1 + A_0 + V_2$, which is of type $[3, (2)_{t_1+1}, 1, 3]$, onto $[2, 2]$ by inner contractions. But for $t_1 \geq 0$ this is impossible; a contradiction.

The divisor $\psi_*(\widetilde{Q}_1 + A_0 - C_1)$ has arithmetic genus one and consists of (-2)-curves, so it contains a (-2)-cycle. Thus there exist $r \geq 2$ and components $U_1, \ldots, U_r$ in $\widetilde{Q}_1 + A_0$, such that $\psi(U_i)$ are (-2)-curves and for $f = \psi(U_1 + \ldots + U_r)$ we have $\psi(U_i) \cdot (f - \psi(U_i)) = 2$ for every i. In particular, $f^2 = 0$. Denote by G_1 the component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ meeting C_1. Note that C_1 is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$, so $G_1^2 = -2$ and $\widetilde{Q}_1 - G_1 - C_1$ has at most two connected components, only one of which may be branched. By 5.2 for each $j \leq c$ the divisor $f_j = E_1 + 2C'_j$ is a fiber of an elliptic fibration θ_j, whose other fibers consist of (-2)-curves. Because ψ does not touch C_1, it does not contract G_1. But because $G_1^2 = \psi(G_1)^2 = -2$, ψ does not even touch G_1.

Claim. *$\psi(G_1)$ is a component of f.*

Suppose not. Then f is vertical for the fibration θ_1 and $\psi(G_1)$ is a 2-section. By the Kodaira classification we infer that $2f$ is a fiber of θ_1. We have $c = 1$, otherwise C_2 would be a 2-section of the fibration, which is impossible, because it is disjoint from $\psi(\widetilde{Q}_1)$. Furthermore, $\psi(G_1)$ is the unique horizontal component of D_1. Some $\psi(U_i)$, say $\psi(U_1)$, meets $\psi(G_1)$. Then U_1 meets G_1. Since f is a cycle, $\psi^*(f)_{red}$ is a cycle containing A_0. Because the divisor $\widetilde{Q}_1 - \psi^*(f)_{red}$ is not touched by ψ, it consists of C_1 and some number of (-2)-curves. But G_1 touches U_1, so in fact it is a chain of type $[(2)_t, 1]$ for some $t \geq 1$. Let Q'_1 and U'_1 be the images of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ and U_1 after the contraction of the latter chain. Then Q'_1 is a chain and U'_1 is its unique (-1)-curve. The image of A_0, which is a (-1)-curve, meets Q'_1 in tips. We know that Q'_1 is of one of two types in 3.7. The fact that ψ maps $Q'_1 - U'_1$ onto a nonempty chain of (-2)-curves implies (an easy induction) that if Q'_1 is of the first type then $m_2 = x$ and $m_{2i-1} = 0$, $m_{2i+2} = x - 1$ for $i \geq 1$ if $x \neq -1$ and $k = m_1 = 1$ otherwise. Similarly, for the second type we get $m_1 = x + 1$ and $m_{2k+1} = x - 1$, $m_{2k} = 0$ for $i \geq 1$ if $y \neq 0$ and $k = m_1 = 1$ otherwise. If, extending our previous notation, by $(a, b)_m$ we denote the sequence $(a, b, a, b, \ldots, a, b)$, where the pair is repeated m times, then Q' is in both cases of type $[x + 3, 2, 1, 3, (2)_x]$ or

$$[(x + 2)_k, x + 3, 1, (2)_{x+1}, 3, ((2)_{x-1}, 3)_k, (2)_x]$$

for some $k \geq 0$ and $x \geq 1$. We infer that U_1 is not touched by ψ, so it is a (-2)-curve, which gives $t = 1$. Let U_2 denote the component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ meeting U_1 which has self-intersection $-x - 3$. It is not contracted by ψ, so the contraction of $\widetilde{Q}_1 + A_0 - U_2$ maps X_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 onto a unicuspidal curve for which the cusp is semi-ordinary. This contradicts 4.6.

Claim. *$\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork with G_1 as the branching component.*

Because G_1 is not touched by ψ, the claim above implies that it is a branching component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Since $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contracts to a smooth point, there is a maximal twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$, say T, meeting G_1. The curve $\psi(G_1)$ is a component of f, so A_0 meets T. Suppose there is another branching component in $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Say V is the one nearest to G_1 inside D_0. Let $W_1 + \ldots + W_z$, $z \geq 1$ be the shortest chain in $\widetilde{Q}_1$ such that $W_z = V$ and $W_1 \cdot G_1 = 1$. In particular $W_1, \ldots, W_{z-1}$ are non-branching in $\widetilde{Q}_1$.

Suppose ψ does not touch the chain $W_1 + \ldots + W_{z-1}$. Because G_1 meets W_1, the latter chain consists of non-branching (-2)-curves which are contracted by π_0 subsequently after C_1 and G_1. Because $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contracts to a smooth point we necessarily have $T = [(2)_t, z+1]$ and $V^2 = -t-3$ for some $z, t \geq 1$. In fact $z \geq 2$, otherwise either ψ creates a (-1)-curve in $D_1 - E_1$ or it touches G_1, which was already shown to be impossible. Let U_1, U_2 be the connected components of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - V$ not containing C_1. One of them, say U_2, is not touched by ψ, so it consists of (-2)-curves, hence it is a chain. Write $U_2 = [(2)_{u_2}]$ with $u_2 \geq 1$. Then the component of U_1 meeting V has self-intersection $-u_2 - 2 \leq -3$, so it is touched or contracted by ψ. Recall that A_0 meets T. Because $\psi(V)^2 = -2$, ψ touches V exactly $t+1 \geq 2$ times, so U_1 is a chain contracted by ψ. We get $U_1 = [(2)_{u_1}, u_2 + 2]$. Since $z \geq 2$, there are more than two components in $\widetilde{Q}_1$ with self-intersection smaller than -2. It follows that A_0 meets the tips of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contained in T and U_1, hence $u_1 = 0$. Because ψ touches V, it contracts U_2, so since A_0 meets Δ_0^-we have $t = u_1 = 0$ and $z = 2$. But then ψ touches G_1; a contradiction.

Therefore ψ touches $W_1 + \ldots + W_{z-1}$, hence $z \geq 2$ and ψ is of type I. It follows that $T = [(2)_{m_1}, 3, (2)_{m_2}]$ for some $m_1 \geq 1$, $m_2 \geq 0$ and hence that W_1 is non-branching with $W_1^2 = -m_2 - 2$. If $m_2 \neq 0$ then A_0 meets W_1 and hence W_2 is a (-2)-curve, so after the contraction of C_1 the image of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contains a chain $[3, (2)_{m_2}, 1, m_2 + 2, 2]$, which is not negative definite; a contradiction. Thus $m_2 = 0$, which implies that $W_2^2 = -m_1 - 3 \leq -4$ and hence A_0 meets W_2. Then the image of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ after the contraction of $C_1 + G_1 + W_1 + T$ consists of a (-1)-curve and some number of (-2)-curves. Being contractible to a point, it is of type $[1, 2, \ldots, 2]$ with W_z as the (-1)-tip. But then $V = W_z$ cannot be branching in $\widetilde{Q}_1$; a contradiction.

Let V_1, V_2 be the components of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ met by A_0. Because $\eta = 0$, we may assume V_1 is a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contained in a (-2)-twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Denote the maximal twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing V_1 by T_1. Let T_2 be the second twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ other than C_1. Suppose V_2 is not a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Then ψ is of type I. If $V_2 \leq T_1$ then ψ does not touch T_2, so T_2 consists of (-2)-curves, hence $T_1 = [(2)_{t_1}, t_2 + 3]$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq 0$. But then V_1 and V_2 are tips of T_1, and then we see that ψ creates a (-1)-curve in $D_1 - E_1$; a contradiction. Thus V_2 is a component of T_2 and ψ does not touch $T_2 - V_2$. Because R_1 consists of (-2)-curves, $T_2 - V_2$ consists of (-2)-curves and $T_1 = [(2)_{t_1}, 3, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1 \geq 1$ and $t_2 \geq 0$. Because V_2 is not a tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$, T_2 has at least two components, so 3.7 implies that $T_2 = [(2)_{t_3}, t_1 + 3, t_2 + 2]$ for some $t_3 \geq 0$. It follows that $t_2 = 0$, so after contracting C_1 the image of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is of type $[(2)_{t_1}, 3, 1, 2, t_1 + 3, (2)_{t_2}]$. Let U be the component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ meeting G_1 which has self-intersection -3. The contraction of $D_0 + A_0 - U$ maps X_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 onto a cuspidal curve with semi-ordinary cusps. By 4.6 the latter is Cremona equivalent to a line; a contradiction.

We are left with the case when both V_1, V_2 are tips of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Then $f = \psi(\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1)$ is a (-2)-cycle. Let U be a component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - G_1 - C_1$ meeting G_1. Then $\psi(\widetilde{Q}_1 - U + A_0)$ is a

chain of type $[2,\dots,2,1]$ and C_1 is its tip. Thus the contraction of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - U + A_0$ maps X_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and maps E_0 onto a cuspidal curve with semi-ordinary cusps; a contradiction. □

Corollary 5.4. *If $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is a complex rational cuspidal curve which is not Cremona equivalent to a line and (X_n, D_n, E_n) is as in 4.1 then*

$$|K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n)| \leq p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2 \leq 2.$$

Proof. By 1.1 $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \in \{3, 4\}$, so $\zeta = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) \leq p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2$ by 5.1. By 4.5(iv) $\zeta \geq 2 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. □

6. The length of the minimalization process

Recall that n is the length of the minimalization process $\psi = \psi_n \circ \ldots \circ \psi_1 : (X_0, \frac{1}{2}D_0) \to (X_n, \frac{1}{2}D_n)$ or, equivalently, of the process $\psi' = \psi'_n \circ \ldots \circ \psi'_1 \colon (X, \frac{1}{2}D) \to (X'_n, \frac{1}{2}D'_n)$ defined in Section 4.1. Because 1.1 gives $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq 3$, we have now better restrictions on D_n. In particular, by 4.2(iv) $n + \operatorname{ind}(D'_n) \leq 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 2$. As we now show, this basically leads to Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We have $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq 3$ by 1.1, so 4.2(iv) gives $\operatorname{ind}(D'_n) + n \leq 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 2$. Suppose $n > 1$. Then $n = 2$, $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 3$ and $\operatorname{ind}(D'_2) = 0$, so D'_2 has no twigs. It follows that $s = 0$, i.e. ψ_0 does not contract any maximal twig of D. In particular, $\tau^*_j = \tau_j - 1 \geq 1$ for each $j \leq c$, so $\tau^* = \tau - c \geq c$. Let $t(B)$ denote the number of maximal twigs of a divisor B. Properties of A_i (see (4.2)) imply that $t(D'_{i+1}) - t(D'_i) \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ for $i < 2$, so $t(D) \leq t(D'_2) + 4 = 4$ and hence $c \leq 2$. Because of the minimality of the resolution $\pi \colon (X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, we have $t(D) \geq 3$. By 5.4 $|\zeta| \leq 1$. By 4.4 we have

$$\gamma_2 + \tau^* + (2 - \eta) + (n_0 - \eta_0) \leq 2\zeta + 6, \tag{6.1}$$

$$c + (2 - n_{exc}) + K_2 \cdot R_2 \leq 3 - \zeta. \tag{6.2}$$

Since $\gamma_2 + \tau^* \geq 4 + c \geq 5$, we get $\zeta \in \{0, 1\}$. Let A'_0 and A'_1 be the proper transforms of A_0, A_1 on X. Note that ψ_1, which contracts A_0, does not touch the proper transform of A_1 on X_0, so we denote it also by A_1. We have $K_2^2 = \zeta - K_2 \cdot E_2 = \zeta + 2 - \gamma_2$. By 4.2(iii) $\#\psi(\widetilde{Q}_1 + \widetilde{Q}_2) = \rho(X_2) + 1 = 11 - K_2^2 = 9 - \zeta + \gamma_2$, so $\#D_2 \geq 13$.

Claim. $c = 1$.

Suppose $c = 2$. Then D has four maximal twigs and, because D'_2 has no twigs, each A'_j, $j = 0, 1$ meets exactly two tips of D, so $n_0 = n = 2$. We have $\eta > 0$, otherwise (6.1) gives $5 \leq \gamma_2 + \tau^* \leq 2\zeta + 2 \leq 4$, which is impossible. Let L be a component of Υ_2, say, $\psi_*^{-1}(L) \leq \widetilde{Q}_1$. Because $\Delta_2^+ = 0$, we have $\beta_{D_2}(L) = 2$, so since D_2 is snc-minimal, L meets only one component of $D_2 - L$. Then one of the A_j's, say A_0, meets $\widetilde{Q}_1$ twice. Then $A_0 \cdot \widetilde{Q}_2 = 0$ and $A_1 \cdot \widetilde{Q}_1 = 0$, so $\pi_0(A_0)$ and $\pi_0(A_1)$ are disjoint curves on $\mathbb{P}^2$; a contradiction.

Now E is a maximal twig of $D = D'_0$ and $\tau^* = \tau - 1 \geq 1$. Since $t(D'_2) = 0$ we have $n_1 \geq 1$, so $n_0 \leq 1$. Denote the component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1$ meeting E_0 by U. We have $U \cdot E_0 = 1$.

Claim. $\eta = 0$.

Suppose $\eta \neq 0$. Let L be a component of $\Upsilon_2 \cap \mathcal{L}$. Because $A_0 \cdot A_1 = 0$, changing the order of contractions if necessary, we may assume that ψ_1 creates the (-1)-curve L. As noted above $\beta_{D_2}(L) = 2$ and L meets some component B of $D_2 - L$ twice. It follows that

$\psi_*^{-1}(L) \neq U$ and $A_0 \cdot E_0 = 0$. We see that $\eta = \eta_0 \geq 1$ and, since $\eta_0 \leq n_0 \leq 1$, that $\Upsilon_2 \cap \mathcal{L}$ has only one component. We obtain $n_0 = n_1 = 1$ and $\eta = \eta_0 = 1$. Denote the proper transforms of L and B on X_0 by L' and B' respectively. By (6.2) $K_2 \cdot R_2 \leq 2$, so $B^2 \geq -4$. By 4.2(vi) and 4.3(i) $B' \cdot E_0 + 1 \geq B \cdot E_2 \geq 8 + 2B^2$. If $B = C_1'$ then we get $\tau_1^* \geq 4$, which is impossible by (6.1). Thus $B \neq C_1'$ and hence $B' \cdot E_0 \leq 1$, so $B^2 \in \{-3, -4\}$. Suppose $B \cdot E_2 > 1$. Then $B' = U$ and U meets a (-2)-twig contracted by ψ_2. Since L meets B twice, A_0 meets some other twig meeting B'. But because $t(D_2') = 0$, A_0 meets also a twig in the connected component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - B'$ containing C_1, so it cannot create a (-1)-curve meeting B twice (note C_1 and U are not contracted by ψ); a contradiction. Thus $B \cdot E_2 \leq 1$, so $B^2 = -4$ and $K_2 \cdot (R_2 - B) = 0$. By (6.1) and (6.2) $\zeta = 0$, $n_{exc} = 2$, $\gamma_2 = 4$ and $\tau^* = 1$.

Suppose $t(D) = 3$. Then $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a chain. Since L meets B twice, A_0 meets only one connected component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1$, the one containing B'. Because $A_1 \cdot E_1 = 1$ and $n = n_{exc}$, we infer that the second connected component consists of (-2)-curves. Hence $\widetilde{Q}_1 = [(2)_{t_1}, 1, t_1 + 2, (t_2)]$ for some $t_1, t_2 \geq 1$. Then $B' = [t_1 + 2]$ and A_0 meets B' and the tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contained in $[(2)_{t_2}]$. We see that $\#D_2 = 5$; a contradiction.

Thus $t(D) = 4$, so $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork. Because $t(D_2') = 0$, now A_0 meets two tips of D_0 and both maximal twigs T_1, T_2 of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing them meet B'. The curve B' is the unique branching component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$, L' is a component of $T_1 + T_2$ and ψ_1 contracts $A_0 + T_1 + T_2 - L'$. Put $T_3 = \widetilde{Q}_1 - T_1 - T_2 - B'$. The curve A_1 meets E_0 and the tip of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contained in T_3. Hence ψ_2 does not touch $\psi_1(B')$. Since ψ_2 is of type I and creates a (non-superfluous) (-1)-curve in $D_2 - E_2$, we infer that the connected component of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1$ met by A_1 is a chain of (-2)-curves containing U. Then $T_3 = [(2)_{t_1}, 1, t_1 + 2, (2)_{t_2}]$ for some $t_1 \geq 1$ and $t_2 \geq 0$ or $T_3 = [(2)_{t_1}, 1]$ for some $t_1 \geq 0$. The divisor $\widetilde{Q}_1$ contracts to a smooth point, so after the contraction of T_3 the curve B' becomes a (-1)-curve. The inequality $(B')^2 \leq B^2 \leq -4$, shows that the contraction of T_3 touches B' more than once. The latter is possible only if $T_3 = [(2)_{t_1}, 1]$. Because ψ_2 contracts $A_1 + [(2)_{t_1 - 1}]$, we see that $\#D_2 = 5$; a contradiction.

Claim. *$\zeta = n_0 = \tau^* = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 4$ and $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$.*

The inequality (6.1) gives $\gamma_2 + \tau^* + n_0 \leq 4 + 2\zeta$, so $\zeta = 1$ and $\tau^* \leq 2$. By (4.4) $K_2 \cdot \psi(\widetilde{Q}_1) = -\tau^* - \zeta = -\tau^* - 1$. Recall that $n_0 \leq 1$. Suppose $n_0 = 0$. Then $t(D) = 3$ and both A_0, A_1 meet E_0, hence ψ contracts exactly A_0, A_1 and two maximal (-2)-twigs of D_0 meeting them. It follows that $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a chain and $K_0 \cdot \widetilde{Q}_1 = K_2 \cdot \psi(\widetilde{Q}_1) + 2 = 1 - \tau^* \leq 0$. By 3.6 $\widetilde{Q}_1 = [(2)_t, 1]$ or $\widetilde{Q}_1 = [(2)_t, 3, 1, 2]$ for some $t \geq 0$. Then $\#D_2 \leq 4$; a contradiction. We obtain $\gamma_2 + \tau^* \leq 5$, hence $\gamma_2 = 4$ and $\tau^* = 1$. By 4.3(vi) $\#\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$.

The above claim gives $K_2 \cdot \psi(\widetilde{Q}_1 - C_1) = -1$, or equivalently, $K_2 \cdot R_2 = n_{exc} - 1 \leq 1$, so $n_{exc} \geq 1$. We may assume A_1 (contracted by ψ_2) meets E_0 and A_0 (contracted by ψ_1) does not.

Claim. *ψ_1 does not create a (-1)-curve in $D_1 - E_1$.*

Suppose ψ_1 creates a (-1)-curve in $D_1 - E_1$. Denote the image of this (-1)-curve on X_2 by L and its proper transform on X_0 by L'. Since $A_0 \cdot E_0 = 0$, we have $L \cdot E_2 = L' \cdot E_0 \leq 1$. But if $L \cdot E_2 = 1$ then the contraction of L maps E_2 onto a (-3)-curve on a smooth rational surface, which is impossible (see 2.4(iii)). Thus $L \cdot E_2 = 0$. Also, $L \cdot C_1' = 0$, because otherwise 4.3(i) gives $\tau_1 \geq 4$, which is false.

Suppose there is a component of $D_2 - L$ which meets L at least twice. Clearly, $M \cdot E_2 \leq \psi_*^{-1}(M) \cdot E_0 + 1 \leq 2$. By 4.3(i) $M \cdot E_2 + 2K_2 \cdot M \geq 4$, so since $K_2 \cdot R_2 = n_{exc} - 1 \leq 1$, we

get $M \cdot E_2 = 2$, $K_2 \cdot M = 1$ and $n_{exc} = 2$. Then $\psi_*^{-1}(M) = U$ and ψ_2 touches $\psi_1(U)$. Since $n_{exc} = 2$, ψ_2 creates a (-1)-curve in $D_2 - E_2$. Because ψ_1 is of type I, this (-1)-curve is necessarily M, hence $K_2 \cdot M = -1$; a contradiction.

The divisor $\psi(\widetilde{Q}_1)$ contains a unique reduced cycle of rational curves. The cycle contains L, so we can write it as $V + L$, where L is not a component of V. Because L meets each component of D_2 at most once, L meets two components V_1, V_2 of V. By 4.3(iii) they are components of R_2. We have $R_2 \cdot E_2 = \psi_*^{-1}(R_2) \cdot E_0 + 1 \leq U \cdot E_1 + 1 \leq 2$. If $V_1^2 = V_2^2 = -2$ then $f = V_1 + 2L + V_2$ is nef, hence $0 \leq f \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) = (V_1 + V_2) \cdot E_2 - 4 \leq R_2 \cdot E_2 - 4 < 0$; a contradiction. Thus $V_1^2 = -3$ and $V - V_1$ consists of (-1)- and (-2)-curves. Write f_R for the sum of components of f which are also components of R_2. We have $C_1' \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) = 0$ and $L' \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) \leq \psi_*^{-1}(L') \cdot E_2 - 1 \leq 0$ for every L' in $\mathcal{L}$. Therefore for $f = V + 2L$ we get $f \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) \leq f_R \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) - 4 \leq 2R_2 \cdot K_2 + R_2 \cdot E_2 - 4 \leq 0$. But f is nef, so $f \cdot (2K_2 + E_2) \geq 0$. In particular, $f_R \cdot K_2 = 1$, so $n_{exc} = 2$. Also, $f_R \cdot E_2 = 2$, so f_R contains $\psi(U)$ and ψ_2 contracts a (-2)-twig meeting U. Then U is branching in $\widetilde{Q}_1$, and hence it is the unique branching component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Since $n = n_{exc}$, ψ_2 creates a (-1)-curve in $D_2 - E_2$, which is necessarily $\psi(U)$, hence $\psi_1(U)$ is not a (-1)-curve. Because A_0 joins tips of a twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing C_1 with some other twig meeting U, the only (non-superfluous) (-1)-curve in D_1 it can create is $\psi_1(U)$. But ψ_2 touches $\psi_1(U)$, so $L = \psi(U)$ has a non-negative self-intersection; a contradiction with 4.3(v).

The above claim gives $n_{exc} = 1$ and hence $K_2 \cdot R_2 = 0$. Let $L \leq \mathcal{L}$ be the (-1)-curve created by ψ_2. Clearly, L meets E_2. In fact, since $\gamma_2 = 4$, by the argument above $L \cdot E_2 \geq 2$. By 4.3(vii) $\psi_*^{-1}(L) \cdot E_0 \geq 1$, so $\psi_*^{-1}(L) = U$ and $\psi(U) \cdot E_2 = 2$, so again ψ_2 contracts some (-2)-twig $[(2)_t]$, $t \geq 1$, meeting U. If U is a branching component of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ then the maximal twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing C_1 is of type $[(2)_v, 1]$ for some $v \geq 1$ and, since $t(D_2') = 0$, A_0 meets its tip, so ψ_1 touches C_1, which is in contradiction with $\mathcal{C}_+ = 0$. Put $u = -U^2 - 2 \geq 0$. If $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a chain then it is of type $[(2)_t, u+2, 1, (2)_u, t+3, (v)]$ for some $v \geq 1$, so since $K_2 \cdot R_2 = 0$, the curve with self-intersection $-t - 3 \leq -4$ meets A_0, and hence ψ_1 creates a (-1)-curve, in contradiction to the last claim.

We infer that $\widetilde{Q}_1$ is a fork and its unique branching component B is different than U. Since ψ_2 touches B, it follows that U is contained in a maximal twig of $\widetilde{Q}_1$. Also, ψ_1 does not touch U, so $U^2 = -2$. If C_1 does not meet B then the maximal twig containing U is necessarily of type $[(2)_{t+1}, 1, t+3, (2)_v]$, $v \geq 0$ and $[t+3, (2)_v]$ is not touched by ψ, contradicting the equality $K_2 \cdot R_2 = 0$. Therefore, C_1 meets B and the maximal twig T of $\widetilde{Q}_1$ containing U is of type $[(2)_{t+1}, 1]$. Since $\psi(B)$ is smooth, one of the components of $\widetilde{Q}_1 - T$ meeting B, call it U', is not contracted by ψ. Then the contraction of $\widetilde{Q}_1 + A_0 - U' + A_1 - U$ maps X_0 onto $\mathbb{P}^2$ and E_0 onto a unicuspidal curve with a semi-ordinary cusp. By 4.6 this is a contradiction. □

7. The Coolidge-Nagata conjecture

With the knowledge about the minimalization process from Section 4 and Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 in hand we can now prove Theorem 1.2. We make use of the log BMY inequality (7.1) and of the non-negativeness of the intersection of $2K_i + E_i$ with the positive part of the Zariski decomposition of $K_i + D_i$ (7.2).

We keep the assumption that the rational cuspidal curve $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ is not Cremona equivalent to a line, i.e. we assume $\bar{E} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^2$ violates the Coolidge-Nagata conjecture. Let (X_i, D_i) and (X_i', D_i'), $i = 0, \ldots, n$ be the models defined in 4.1. Recall that $(X_0', D_0') = (X, D)$. By 4.2(i) D_i' is snc-minimal. Recall that the surface $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is of log general type

and contains no $\mathbb{C}^1$. It follows that $X_i' \setminus D_i'$, which is its open subset, is of log general type and contains no $\mathbb{C}^1$. Put $K_i' = K_{X_i'}$ and $\mathcal{P}_i = (K_i' + D_i')^+$. By 2.1 $(K_i' + D_i')^- = \operatorname{Bk} D_i'$. Let $t(D_i')$ be the number of maximal twigs of D_i'. Let E_i' and A_i' be the proper transforms of $\bar{E}$ and respectively of A_i on X_i'. By 2.4(iii) $-(E_i')^2 \geq 4$. Recall that n_1 is the number of A_i's contracted by ψ meeting E_i, or equivalently, the number of A_i''s meeting E_i'. We extend this notation by defining $n_1(j)$ to be the number of A_i''s with $i < j$ meeting E_i'. In particular, $n_1(i) \leq i$, $n_1(n) = n_1$ and $n_1(0) = 0$. Note that E_i' is a maximal twig of D_i' if and only if $c = 1$ and $n_1(i) = 0$. Put $t_E(D_i') = 1$ if $(c, n_1(i)) = (1, 0)$ and $t_E(D_i') = 0$ otherwise.

Taking a smooth fiber of any $\mathbb{P}^1$-fibration of X we see that $f \cdot (mK + E) = -2m + f \cdot E$, so $f \cdot (mK + E) \to -\infty$ for $m \to \infty$. Thus there exists a maximal integer m_E, for which $h^0(m_E K + E) \neq 0$. We have $h^0(2K + E) \neq 0$, so $m_E \geq 2$.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $m_E \geq 2$ be as above. For each $i \leq n$*

$$\mathcal{P}_i^2 = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + i - 2 + \operatorname{ind}(D_i') \leq 3 \tag{7.1}$$

and

$$t(D_i') + i \leq p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + \operatorname{ind}(D_i') + \delta(D_i') + \frac{1}{m_E} \max(n_1(i) + c - 2, 0). \tag{7.2}$$

Proof. The first relation is just 4.2(iv). Fix $i \leq n$ and denote the sum of maximal twigs of D_i' by T. The divisor $G = D_i' - T$ (which we call the *core of* D_i') has the same arithmetic genus as D_i', i.e. $p_a(G) = p_a(D_i') = i$, hence $(K_i' + G) \cdot G = 2(i - 1)$. The maximal twigs are supported on $\operatorname{Supp} \operatorname{Bk} D_i' = \operatorname{Supp}(K_i' + D_i')^-$ and hence they intersect $\mathcal{P}_i$ trivially. We get

$$\mathcal{P}_i \cdot D_i' = \mathcal{P}_i \cdot G = (K_i' + D_i' - \operatorname{Bk} D_i') \cdot G = (K_i' + G) \cdot G + \beta_{D_i'}(G) - \operatorname{Bk} D_i' \cdot G.$$

By 2.1(ii) the coefficient in $\operatorname{Bk} D_i'$ of the component of the twig T_j which meets G is $\delta(T_j)$. Then $\mathcal{P}_i \cdot D_i' = 2i - 2 + t(D_i') - \delta(D_i')$. We have

$$\mathcal{P}_i \cdot E_i' = (K_i' + D_i' - \operatorname{Bk} D_i') \cdot E_i' = (K_i' + E_i') \cdot E_i' + \beta_{D_i'}(E_i') - \operatorname{Bk} D_i' \cdot E_i'.$$

We check easily that $\operatorname{Bk} D_i' \cdot E_i' = -t_E(X_i')$, hence

$$\mathcal{P}_i \cdot E_i' = -2 + n_1(i) + c + t_E(X_i') = \max(n_1(i) + c - 2, 0).$$

Because $m_E K + E \geq 0$, we have $m_E K_i' + E_i' \geq 0$, so since $\mathcal{P}_i$ is nef, we obtain $0 \leq \mathcal{P}_i \cdot (K_i' + \frac{1}{m_E} E_i') = \mathcal{P}_i \cdot (K_i' + D_i') - \mathcal{P}_i \cdot D_i' + \frac{1}{m_E} \mathcal{P}_i \cdot E_i'$. But

$$\mathcal{P}_i \cdot (K_i' + D_i') = \mathcal{P}_i^2 = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + i - 2 + \operatorname{ind}(D_i'),$$

which leads to (7.2). □

Corollary 7.2. *For each $i \leq n$ we have*

$$t(D_i') + \frac{5}{2} i + p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 9 + \frac{1}{2} \max(n_1(i) - i + c, 2 - i) \leq 9 + \frac{1}{2} \max(c, 2 - i).$$

Furthermore, if the first inequality is an equality then $\mathcal{P}_i^2 = 3$ and $\delta(D_i') = \operatorname{ind}(D_i') = 5 - i - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$, in particular all maximal twigs of D_i' have length 1.

Proof. We have $\delta(D_i') \leq \operatorname{ind}(D_i')$, so 7.1 gives $\operatorname{ind}(D_i') \leq 5 - i - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ and

$$t(D_i') \leq 10 - 3i - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) + \frac{1}{m_E} \max(n_1(i) + c - 2, 0). \tag{7.3}$$

Since $m_E \geq 2$, the first inequality follows. If the equality holds then $\mathcal{P}_i^2 = 3$ and $\delta(D_i') = \operatorname{ind}(D_i')$, which implies that all maximal twigs of D_i' have length 1. The second inequality follows from $n_1(i) \leq i$. □

Corollary 7.3. *With the above notation and assumptions* $2c + t_E(D) \leq t(D) \leq 7$. *Furthermore, if* $t(D) = 7$ *then* $n = 0$ *and* $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = c = 3$.

Proof. Because the log resolution $\pi\colon (X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ is minimal, each $Q_j = \pi^{-1}(q_j)$ contains at least two maximal twigs of D, so $2c + t_E(D) \leq t(D)$. By 1.1 $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \geq 3$. Then 7.2 gives $t(D) + p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 9 + \max(\frac{1}{2}c, 1) \leq 9 + \max(\frac{1}{4}t(D), 1)$, hence $t(D) \leq 12 - \frac{4}{3}p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$. Suppose $t(D) \geq 8$. It follows that $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 3$, $t(D) = 8$ and $c = 4$. Furthermore, all twigs of D have length 1 and $\mathcal{P}_0^2 = 3$. The former implies that $Q_j = [3, 1, 2]$ for every $j \leq c$, hence $\operatorname{ind}(D) = 4 \cdot (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}) = \frac{10}{3}$. By (7.1) $\operatorname{ind}(D) = 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 2$; a contradiction. Thus $t(D) \leq 7$. We infer that $c \leq 3$.

Consider the case $t(D) = 7$. By 7.2 $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 3$. Suppose $n > 0$. We have $t(D_1') \geq t(D) - 2$, so taking $i = 1$ we get $5 \leq t(D_1') \leq 3 + \frac{1}{2}(n_1(1) + c)$, hence $c = 3$ and $n_1(1) = 1$. Then A_0 meets E_0, so $t(D_1') = 6$, and the inequality fails. Thus $n = 0$.

Suppose $c = 2$. Then for $i = 0$ we have an equality in 7.2, so $\delta(D) = \operatorname{ind}(D) = 2$ and all maximal twigs of D have length 1. It follows that the first characteristic pair for each cusp produces a chain $[3, 1, 2]$, so the maximal twigs of D are of types [2], [2], [3], [3], $[x_1]$, $[x_2]$, $[x_3]$ for some $x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \frac{1}{x_i} = 2 - 2 \cdot (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}) = \frac{1}{3}$. It follows that $x_i \geq 4$, so if T is the sum of all maximal twigs then $K \cdot T = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - 4 \geq 8$. By 4.5(iii),(iv) $K \cdot T \leq K \cdot R_0' = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \zeta + c = 5 - \zeta \leq 6$; a contradiction.

Suppose $c = 1$. As above, $\delta(D) = \operatorname{ind}(D) = 2$ and all maximal twigs of D have length 1. They are of types [3], [2], $[\gamma]$, $[x_1]$, $[x_2]$, $[x_3]$, $[x_4]$ for some $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \geq 2$, $\gamma \geq 4$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{1}{x_i} = 2 - (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3}) - \frac{1}{\gamma} < \frac{7}{6}$. We have $K \cdot T = \gamma + \sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i - 9$. Now 4.5(iii),(iv) give $K \cdot T \leq K \cdot R_0' = 4 - \zeta \leq 5$, so $\sum_{i=1}^{4} x_i \leq 10$. If $x_i \leq 3$ for each i then $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{1}{x_i} \geq \frac{4}{3}$, which is impossible. Thus, say, $x_1 \geq 4$. Then $x_1 = 4$ and $x_i = 2$ for $i = 2, 3, 4$, so $\sum_{i=1}^{4} \frac{1}{x_i} = \frac{7}{4}$; a contradiction. □

Corollary 7.4. *If* $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \neq 3$ *then* $n = 0$ *and* $\bar{E}$ *has only one cusp.*

Proof. By 1.1 $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 4$. By 7.1 $n \leq 1$ and if $n = 1$ then D_1' has no twigs. Since ψ_1' contracts at most two twigs, it follows that $n = 0$, otherwise D_1 would have at most two maximal twigs, which is impossible. We have now $\operatorname{ind}(D) \leq 1$, so since the contribution from each cusp is by 3.5 bigger than $\frac{1}{2}$, we obtain $c = 1$. □

Recall that Q_j, $j = 1, \ldots, c$ is the reduced exceptional divisor of $\pi\colon (X, D) \to (\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E})$ over the cusp q_j. Because the unique (-1)-curve of Q_j is not a tip of Q_j, we have $K \cdot Q_j \geq 0$. Recall that $\zeta = K_n \cdot (K_n + E_n) = K_n' \cdot (K_n' + E_n')$.

Proposition 7.5. *If* $n = 0$ *then:*

$$\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_0 + \tau^*) - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq \zeta \leq p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - 2, \tag{7.4}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{c} K \cdot Q_j = p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) - \zeta, \tag{7.5}$$

$$\operatorname{ind}(D) \leq 5 - p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) \leq 2. \tag{7.6}$$

Proof. The first inequality follows from 4.5(iv) and 5.4. The middle equality follows from 4.2(ii). The last inequality follows from 7.1 and Theorem 1.1. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By 2.5 we may assume $\mathbb{P}^2 \setminus \bar{E}$ is of log general type. By 7.3 we may assume that $\bar{E}$ has exactly three cusps and D has six or seven maximal twigs, i.e. $c = 3$ and $t(D) = 6, 7$. By 7.4 $p_2(\mathbb{P}^2, \bar{E}) = 3$.

Claim. *If $n \neq 0$ then $n = 1$, $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') \leq 1$, $t(D) = 6$ and $s \leq 1$. Moreover, A_0' meets a tip of Q_1 and a tip of Q_2.*

By 1.3 $n = 1$. By 7.2 $t(D_1') \leq \frac{1}{2}(9 + n_1)$. Since $t(D_1') \geq t(D) - 1 - n_0 = t(D) - 2 + n_1$, we get $t(D) \leq 6 + \frac{1}{2}(1 - n_1)$. Thus $t(D) = 6$, so each Q_j is a chain. If $n_1 = 1$ then in 7.2 we have an equality, so maximal twigs of D_1' have length 1 and $\delta(D_1') = \mathrm{ind}(D_1') = 1$. But if maximal twigs of D_1' have length 1 then each Q_j is of type $[3, 1, 2]$, so $\delta(D_1') = \frac{5}{2}$. It follows that $n_1 = 0$, and hence $t(D_1') = 4$. Because $t(D) - t(D_1') = 2$, the (-1)-curve A_0' meets two tips of D. By 7.1 $\frac{3}{2} \leq \delta(D_1') + \mathrm{ind}(D_1')$ and $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') \leq 1$. If A_0 meets only one Q_j, then by 3.5 $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$, which is impossible. Thus A_0' meets a tip of, say, Q_1 and a tip of Q_2. If $s \geq 2$ then at least two maximal twigs of D are (-2)-chains and are not touched by ψ' (ψ_0 contracts them). But then $\mathrm{ind}(D_1') > 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}$; a contradiction.

Claim. $n = 0$.

Suppose $n = 1$. By 4.2(i) D_1' is snc-minimal. The above claim shows that $t(D) = 6$, so each Q_j, and hence each $\widetilde{Q}_j$, is a chain. We now look at D_0. Because the components of $D_0 - E_0$ meeting E_0 do not belong to maximal twigs of D_0, they are not contracted by $\psi = \psi_1$. Observe also, that if $\psi(L)$ is a component of $\mathcal{L}$ then, because A_0 meets tips if $\widetilde{Q}_1$ and $\widetilde{Q}_2$, we have $\beta_{D_0}(L) = \beta_{D_1}(\psi(L)) = 3$ and hence $\psi(L) \cdot E_1 = L \cdot E_0 = 1$. Such a $\psi(L)$ does not meet Δ_1^+, so we get $\eta = 0$. Because the previous claim gives also $s \leq 1$, we have $\tau^* \geq 2$. Now 4.4(i) gives $2\zeta \geq \gamma_1 + \tau^* - 4 \geq 2$, so $\zeta \geq 1$. By 5.4 $\zeta = 1$. Then $\tau^* = 2$, $s = 1$ and $\gamma_1 = 4$. Since $\tau_j^* \leq 1$ for each j, 4.3(vi) shows that C_j is not touched by ψ. Then 4.4(ii) reads as $(1 - n_{exc}) + K_1 \cdot R_1 = 0$, which gives $n_{exc} = 1$ and $K_1 \cdot R_1 = 0$. But we already proved that if $\psi_1(L)$ is a component of $\mathcal{L}$ then $\psi_1(L) \cdot E_1 = 1$, so the contraction of $\psi(L)$ maps E_1 onto a smooth (-3)-curve. This is in contradiction with 2.4(iii).

Let ind_j be the contribution to $\mathrm{ind}(D)$ coming from maximal twigs of D contained in Q_j. By 3.5 $\mathrm{ind}_j > \frac{1}{2}$ (note that if Q_j is branched then ind_j is strictly bigger than ind computed for the chain created by the first characteristic pair of Q_j). By 7.5

$$\mathrm{ind}(D) = \mathrm{ind}_1 + \mathrm{ind}_2 + \mathrm{ind}_3 \leq 2$$

and

$$K \cdot Q_1 + K \cdot Q_2 + K \cdot Q_3 = 3 - \zeta,$$

with $\zeta \geq -1$. Suppose $\zeta = -1$. Then 7.5 gives $\tau^* = 0$, hence $\tau_j = 2$, $s_j = 1$ for each j. If Q_j is a chain this implies $K \cdot Q_j = 0$, so by 3.6(ii) $\mathrm{ind}_j \geq \frac{5}{6}$. But at least two Q_j's are chains, hence $\mathrm{ind}(D) > 2 \cdot \frac{5}{6} + \frac{1}{2} > 2$; a contradiction. Thus $\zeta \geq 0$.

Suppose $t(D) = 6$. If Q_j is a chain as in 3.6 then the bigger is k the bigger is ind_j. Using 3.6 we check that $\mathrm{ind}_j \geq \frac{5}{6}$ if $K \cdot Q_j = 0$, $\mathrm{ind}_j \geq \frac{11}{15}$ if $K \cdot Q_j = 1$ and $\mathrm{ind}_j \geq \frac{19}{28}$ if $K \cdot Q_j = 2$. In any case $\mathrm{ind}_j > \frac{2}{3}$. Since $\mathrm{ind}(D) \leq 2$, it follows that there is a Q_j with $K \cdot Q_j \geq 3$, say it is Q_3. But then $\zeta = 0$ and $K \cdot Q_1 = K \cdot Q_2 = 0$, so again $\mathrm{ind}(D) \geq 2 \cdot \frac{5}{6} + \frac{1}{2} > 2$; a contradiction.

Therefore $t(D) = 7$. Exactly one Q_j is branched, say it is Q_3. Let Q_3' be the chain created by the contraction of the maximal twig of Q_3 containing the (-1)-curve and let ind_3' be the contribution to ind_3 coming from the twigs contained in the proper transform of Q_3'. We have $K \cdot Q_3 \geq K \cdot Q_3' + 1 \geq 1$, hence

$$K \cdot Q_1 + K \cdot Q_2 + K \cdot Q_3' \leq 2 - \zeta \leq 2,$$

so $\max(K \cdot Q_1, K \cdot Q_2, K \cdot Q_3') \leq 2$. By the computations above we get $\mathrm{ind}_j > \frac{2}{3}$ for each j, so $\mathrm{ind}(D) > 2$; a contradiction. □

References

1. Wolf P. Barth, Klaus Hulek, Chris A. M. Peters, and Antonius Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*, second ed., Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics, vol. 4, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
2. Julian Lowell Coolidge, *A treatise on algebraic plane curves*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1959.
3. Takao Fujita, *On the topology of noncomplete algebraic surfaces*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **29** (1982), no. 3, 503–566.
4. Yujiro Kawamata, *Addition formula of logarithmic Kodaira dimensions for morphisms of relative dimension one*, Proceedings of the International Symposium on Algebraic Geometry (Kyoto Univ., Kyoto, 1977) (Tokyo), Kinokuniya Book Store, 1978, pp. 207–217.
5. Mariusz Koras, *On contractible plane curves*, Affine algebraic geometry, Osaka Univ. Press, Osaka, 2007, pp. 275–288.
6. Adrian Langer, *Logarithmic orbifold Euler numbers of surfaces with applications*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **86** (2003), no. 2, 358–396.
7. Takashi Matsuoka and Fumio Sakai, *The degree of rational cuspidal curves*, Math. Ann. **285** (1989), no. 2, 233–247.
8. M. Miyanishi and S. Tsunoda, *Absence of the affine lines on the homology planes of general type*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **32** (1992), no. 3, 443–450.
9. Masayoshi Miyanishi, *Open algebraic surfaces*, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 12, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
10. N. Mohan Kumar and M. Pavaman Murthy, *Curves with negative self-intersection on rational surfaces*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **22** (1982/83), no. 4, 767–777.
11. Masayoshi Nagata, *On rational surfaces. I. Irreducible curves of arithmetic genus* 0 *or* 1, Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto Ser. A Math. **32** (1960), 351–370.
12. Karol Palka, *The Coolidge-Nagata conjecture holds for curves with more than four cusps*, arXiv:1202.3491.
13. ———, *Cuspidal curves, minimal models and Zaidenberg's finiteness conjecture*, arXiv:1405.5346.
14. ———, *Exceptional singular* $\mathbf{Q}$*-homology planes*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **61** (2011), no. 2, 745–774, arXiv:0909.0772.
15. Peter Russell, *Hamburger-Noether expansions and approximate roots of polynomials*, Manuscripta Math. **31** (1980), no. 1-3, 25–95.
16. Hisao Yoshihara, *A note on the existence of some curves*, Algebraic geometry and commutative algebra, Vol. II, Kinokuniya, Tokyo, 1988, pp. 801–804.
17. M. G. Zaĭdenberg and S. Yu. Orevkov, *On rigid rational cuspidal plane curves*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **51** (1996), no. 1(307), 149–150, translation in Russian Math. Surveys **51** (1996), no. 1, 179-180.

Karol Palka: Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Śniadeckich 8, 00-656 Warsaw, Poland
E-mail address: palka@impan.pl